DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 350 542 CG 024 596

AUTHOR Madak, Paul R.; Bravi, Gerald D.
TITLE "Second Step: A Violence Prevention Curriculum" in a Western Canadian Elementary School. An Evaluation.
PUB DATE Sep 92
NOTE 109p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Change; *Behavior Problems; Elementary Education; *Elementary School Students; Foreign Countries; Prevention; Program Effectiveness; *Violence
IDENTIFIERS River East School Division 9 MB; *Second Step Program MB

ABSTRACT

The Second Step: A Violence Prevention Curriculum was piloted in Primo Elementary School in western Canada due to concerns about student misbehavior. The Second Step Program is a curriculum based approach for Kindergarten through sixth-grade students. The components of the program are broken down into Kindergarten, grades 1-3, and grades 4-6 packages. Each package includes three units entitled "Empathy Training," "Impulse Control," and "Anger Management." The units are made up of a series of lessons, and the number of lessons varies according to the grade level of the students. In addition, each unit contains one or more videos as support material. Program evaluation included these components: monitoring actual student behavior; conducting a teacher survey; and obtaining teacher comments about each lesson. The evaluation indicated: (1) the total number of behavioral incidents reported increased the second year of the project; (2) the majority of students did not have any reported incidents of misbehavior; (3) the majority of students reported for misbehavior had only one or two incidents; (4) 12.6% of the total school population accounted for 66.1% of all reported incidents; and (5) 95% of all reported incidents of misbehavior involved male students. At best the data were found to be equivocal. In many instances the data indicated that the program had no effect, or even a negative one on student behavior. Appendixes, comprising more than half the document, present task checklists and extensive survey results. (ABL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

CG

ED350542

An Evaluation Of

Second Step: A Violence Prevention Curriculum

In A Western Canadian Elementary School

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Paul R. Madak

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

September 1992

Paul R. Madak, Ph.D.
Gerald D. Bravi, Ph.D.

CG024596

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	**4**
The School	4
Rational for the Project	4
The Program	5
METHOD	**6**
Behavioral Cards	7
Staff Surveys	8
Checklist	
RESULTS	**9**
Behavioral Card Data	9
Total Number of Incidents	10
Individual Misbehaviors	12
Student Group Differences	13
Types of Misbehavior	15
Location and Type of Misbehavior	16
Consequences Applied	18
Staff Survey Data	19
Pre-Program Staff Survey	19
School Wide Misbehavior	19
Classroom Misbehavior	21
Student Competencies	22
Behavioral Cards	22
Post-Program Staff Survey	23
School Wide Misbehavior	23
Classroom Misbehavior	24

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Checklist Data	27
Kindergarten Checklist Results	27
Unit I: Empathy Training	27
Unit II: Impulse Control	28
Summary	29
Grades 1-3 Checklist Results	29
Unit I: Empathy Training	29
Unit II: Impulse Control	30
Unit III: Anger Management	31
Summary	32
Grades 4-6 Checklist Results	32
Unit I: Empathy Training	33
Unit II: Impulse Control	34
Summary	35
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	**35**
APPENDIX A	**39**
APPENDIX B	**61**
APPENDIX C	**80**

An Evaluation Of
Second Step: A Violence Prevention Curriculum
In A Western Canadian Elementary School

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to present the findings of the evaluation of the *Second Step: A Violence Prevention Curriculum* that was piloted by Primo School between January 1, 1992, and June 30, 1992. The *Second Step Program* was developed by the Committee for Children. The Committee for Children is a non-profit organization based in Seattle, Washington and is dedicated to the prevention of child exploitation. The overall goal of the Program is to "...reduce impulsive and aggressive behavior in youth and increase their level of social competence" (Committee For Children, 1990).

The School.

Primo Elementary School is located in the south-west section of the Western Canadian School Division and has a student population of approximately 181 students. The school includes a staff of one principal, 13 teachers, a half-time guidance counsellor, a half-time resource teacher and seven paraprofessionals. Primo's community has an average income of approximately $33,439.00, an unemployment rate of approximately 9.2%, a single parent population of approximately 14%, and 17% of the adult population with a Grade 9 or less education level.

Rationale for the Project.

Concerns about student misbehavior at Primo School led to the development of a process for collecting student behavioral data. This data collection process had the staff complete Incident Report Cards logging the "...more serious infractions by students in our school" (Primo School, 1991). Information from the Incident Report Cards and a

perception that behavioral problems were increasing, caused the staff to list the following reasons for the need to introduce a behavioral management program at Primo School.

1. The need to develop concrete programs to address the stated goals relating to personal and social development, communication skills, and systematic thinking as outlined in the River East School Division Policy Manual.
2. The need to address the growing concern with behavior problems within our school.
3. The need to provide the necessary personal and social skills required to implement the Cooperative Learning model.
4. The need to develop a proactive approach to dealing with school based problems related to student discipline and behavior.
5. The need to broaden the range of skills of teachers to deal with students.
6. The need to have students learn to resolve their own conflicts, thus freeing teachers to concentrate more on academic issues (Primo School, 1991).

The Program.

The Primo staff selected the *Second Step Program* as a possible solution to their problems. The Committee for Children advertises the *Second Step Program* as a primary prevention curriculum that: (a) reduces impulsive and aggressive behavior in children; (b) promotes social competence that allows children to positively affect their environment; (c) has a positive impact on classroom management, classroom learning and school climate; and (d) can be integrated into many subject areas. The stated goals of the Program are as follows.

1. To increase children's ability to identify others' feelings, take others' perspectives, and respond emphatically to others.
2. To decrease impulsive and aggressive behavior through learning and practicing a self-instructional, problem-solving strategy, combined with behavioral social skills.
3. To decrease feelings of anger and encourage social problem-solving in children through the recognition of anger warning signs and triggers and the use of anger reduction. (Committee For Children, 1990).

The *Second Step Program* is a curriculum based approach for K-6 students. The components of the program are broken down into Kindergarten, Grades 1-3 and Grades 4-6 packages. Each package includes three units entitled "Empathy Training", "Impulse Control", and "Anger Management". The units are made up of a series of lessons, and the number of lessons varies according to the grade level of the students. In addition, each unit contains one or more videos as support material.

The *Second Step Program* was designed to be presented over a longer time period, as opposed to a one or two week block. In the case of Primo Elementary School, the staff decided to conduct the *Second Step Program* between February 1, 1992, and June 30, 1992. To ensure that the Program was implemented appropriately, an all day training session was conducted by a representative of the Committee for Children on January 24, 1992.

METHOD

The evaluation was designed in collaboration with the principal and guidance counsellor. The first step in the evaluation process was to establish what was to be evaluated. Given the limited nature of the evaluation budget, it was decided to limit the evaluation to three components. These components included (a) monitoring actual student behavior to assess whether the *Second Step Program* resulted in a reduction of student misbehavior, (b) conducting a pre-post teacher survey to assess teacher attitudes toward the Program, and (c) obtaining teacher comments about each unit and lesson. The Committee for Children had already carried out several assessments of the impact of the Program on student knowledge gains. Therefore, we decided not to repeat that research.

Behavioral Cards.

To document incidents of student misbehavior, the staff designed a Behavioral Incident Report Card. The purpose of the Card was to document the more serious

infractions of the students at Primo School. The documentation process was initiated one-and-a-half years before the implementation of the *Second Step Program* and as a result, the school had baseline data to use to evaluate whether the Program reduced the incidence of student misbehavior. To our knowledge, this type of longitudinal data had not previously been collected as part of an evaluation of the *Second Step Program.*

The information recorded on the Behavioral Cards included: (a) student's name; (b) grade level; (c) House (an internal organization of the students into groupings); (d) date of misbehavior; (e) description of misbehavior; (f) action taken by teacher and/or school administration (e.g., student given a reprimand, student lost one recess, parent contacted, etc.); (g) teacher signature; (h) student signature; and (i) if requested, parent signature. The school began collecting data related to misbehavior at the beginning of the 1990-91 school year. As a result, baseline data were available for September to December 1990, January to June 1991 and September to December 1991 (see Appendix A, Tables 1-8). To obtain comparison data, the school staff was asked to continue filling out the Behavioral Cards after the introduction of the *Second Step Program* (January to June 1992).

Staff Surveys.

The first survey, a pre-program survey, asked staff for their opinions about the incidence of student misbehavior in their classrooms and in Primo School. They were then asked to compare their opinions with what they thought the incidence of misbehavior was in classrooms and schools similar to their own. The staff were also asked about their opinions concerning (a) the effectiveness of their classroom rules and consequences; (b) the effectiveness of Primo School rules and consequences; (c) the types of misbehavior they encounter; (d) their own ability to handle misbehavior; (c) the effectiveness of the Primo School administration's ability to handle misbehavior; (d) the characteristics of rule breakers (e.g., male or female, etc.); (e) the utility of the Behavioral Card system; and (f)

the social and behavioral skills of Primo students (see Appendix B for a copy of the pre-survey).

The post-program survey also asked the staff for their opinions about the incidence of misbehavior in Primo School. This information was used to ascertain if they thought the introduction of the *Second Step Program* had had an effect (positive or negative) on student misbehavior. The survey provided the staff with a list of specific behaviors and asked if these behaviors had increased, stayed the same, or decreased since the implementation of the Program. The staff were asked whether or not the changes they saw were attributable to the Program. The survey also asked them to rate: (a) student learning of specific social skills; (b) the overall value of the *Second Step Program* to them and the school; (c) their willingness to continue with the program; (d) their willingness to recommend the Program to other schools; and (e) what improvements should be made to the Program or its implementation at Primo School (see Appendix C for a copy of the post-survey).

Checklists.

The final component of the evaluation process included the development of checklists that asked each teacher, after teaching a lesson, to evaluate the quality of the lesson and its impact on student behavior. In addition, checklists were developed to evaluate the videos that were attached to the units. Specifically, teachers were asked: (a) to record the time they spent on each lesson or video; (b) if the lesson and accompanying materials were appropriate for their students' level of development; (c) to rate the quality of the instructions for each lesson or video; (d) to rate the quality of the materials provided for the lesson or video; (e) whether they had modified the lesson in any way; (f) did the lesson keep the students involved; (g) if the materials motivated the students; (h) if the materials allowed for adequate student evaluation; (i) if the lesson provided for adequate student feedback; (j) if they made use of all the materials recommended for the

lesson; (k) to rate the overall quality of the lesson; and (l) what affect the lesson had on student behavior. One set of checklists was developed for each of the grade level groupings -- Kindergarten, Grades 1-3, and Grades 4-6. Since each set of checklists was 70 pages in length, space limitations did not permit their inclusion in this report. Complete sets of the checklists may be obtained form the authors or from River East School Division No. 9.

RESULTS

The results of the evaluation are organized into three sections: (1) Behavioral Card Data; (2) Teacher Surveys; and (3) Checklists. The pilot project began with an all day inservice on January 24, 1992. The inservice was conducted by a representative of the Committee for Children. The evaluators attended the inservice so they would be familiar with the goals and implementation plans for the *Second Step Program.*

Behavioral Card Data.

The principal of Primo School provided the researchers with the Behavioral Cards at two times during the evaluation process. The pre-program Behavioral Cards were given to the researchers at the end of December 1991, and the Behavioral Cards collected after the introduction of the *Second Step Program* were provided at the end of June 1992. To protect the identity of the students and staff at Primo School, numerical codes were assigned to each student and staff member. Only the numerical codes were entered into the computer. When the coding was completed, the Behavioral Cards were returned to the school. The results of the analyses carried out on the Behavioral Cards are presented in Tables 1-8 in Appendix A.

For analytic purposes, the data were organized into four Critical Time Periods: (1) September to December 1990; (2) January to June 1991; (3) September to December

1991; and (4) January to June 1992. We analyzed the data using two procedures.

Procedure #1. Increases or decreases for behavioral incidents reported after the introduction of the *Second Step Program* were computed by using the following formula: [[X + 3] - Y] + [X + 3] = Z.

X = the number of incidents reported for critical periods 1, 2, and 3

Y = the incidents reported for critical period 4 (after the introduction of the *Second Step Program*

Z = % of increase or decrease of reported incidents after the introduction of the *Second Step Program*

Procedure #2. A research project of this type has the potential for sensitizing participants to misbehavior and might result in the reporting of behaviors that would normally not be reported (i.e., Hawthorne Effect). To account for this phenomenon we also examined the data by computing percentage increases or decreases for the critical time periods in the year during which the Program was in effect (i.e., [X - Y] + 3 = Z).

X = the number of incidents reported for critical period 3

Y = the incidents reported for critical period 4 (after the introduction of the *Second Step Program*

Z = % of increase or decrease for reported incidents after the introduction of the *Second Step Program*

The two methods were used to analyze the outcomes from two different perspectives. We felt that these two methods would take into account most of the factors limiting the examination of the true effects of the *Second Step Program.*

Total Number of Incidents. - The total number of reported misbehaviors, classified by year and gender, is presented in Table 1 (see Appendix A). From the Table it can be seen that there were more misbehaviors reported during the 1991-92 school year (238 incidents) than there were during 1990-91 (163 incidents). These figures represent a 46.0% increase in reported student misbehavior during the 1991-92 school year. When a comparison was done using Procedure #1, we found a 44.0% increase in behavioral incidents after the introduction of the *Second Step Program.* This might be explained by the overall increase in Year 2 incidents. However, Procedure #2, which attempted to

control for this affect, also found an increase (i.e., 20.4%) after the introduction of the Program. Therefore, our data analyses indicated that while the *Second Step Program* was being conducted, there was an increase in the number of reported misbehaviors.

There are several possible reasons for the increase in the number of misbehaviors reported during the 1991-92 school year and for each critical time period of the year. First, as discussed above, we believe that the initiation of the research project in Fall 1991 might have started a process that sensitized the staff members to student misbehavior and resulted in the reporting of more incidents. The implementation of the *Second Step Program* in Spring 1992 could have caused additional sensitization to and reporting of misbehavior during this critical time period. Support for this position might be drawn from the following comparisons: (1) a 17.4% increase between the Fall 1990 and Fall 1991 totals, (2) a dramatic increase (83.1%) between the Spring 1991 and Spring 1992 totals, and (3) a 30.6% increase between Fall 1991 and Spring 1992. Increases of this type often occur when subjects know that they are being monitored. While we attempted to control for this phenomenon by using Procedure #2, the affect might have been so large that this precaution was not adequate.

Second, the case could be made that the increase in student misbehavior resulted from yearly fluctuations in the data. Yearly fluctuations might be caused by students (i.e., individuals or a Grade 6 group) with low levels of misbehavior leaving Primo School, and new students, more prone to misbehavior, entering the school. Given time constraints imposed on the evaluation, we were unable to examine the affect of the exit or entry of individual students. However, an examination of Table 3 indicated that data fluctuations were not caused by the exit of the Grade 6 class.

Third, it was possible that instead of reducing student misbehavior, the introduction of the *Second Step Program* increased it. We believe that the Program needs to be studied for a longer period of time in order to account for these possibilities.

Given that the evaluation of the *Second Step Program* was limited to the Spring 1992, it is impossible to state which of the above possibilities might be correct.

Another finding that is noteworthy from Table 1 is that 95.0% of all the reported incidents of misbehaviors over the two year period involved male students. The increase in misbehaviors (48.1%) during the 1991-92 school year included increases for both males (55.2%) and females (85.7%). It should be noted, that due to the small number of female incidents reported a small numerical increase resulted in a large percentage increase.

Individual Misbehavior. - Table 2 presents the number of behavioral incidents reported for individual students (see Appendix A). Of the 181 students attending Primo Elementary School, 86 (47.5%) were reported for misbehavior over the two year data collection period. Analysis of the data in Table 2 indicated that of these 86 students:

1. 44 (51.2%) students had only 1 or 2 reported incidents and these students accounted for 14.5% (58) of the total reported incidents;
2. 20 (23.3%) students had 3 to 5 reported incidents and accounted for 19.5% (78) of the total incidents;
3. 11 (12.8%) students had 6 to 9 reported incidents and accounted for 19.7% (79) of all reported incidents; and,
4. 11 (12.8%) students had more than 10 reported incidents and accounted for 46.4% (186) of the total.

It is also noteworthy that 12.2% of all Primo students accounted for 66.1% of all reported misbehavior. Even more dramatic, only 6.1% of the student body accounted for 46.4% of all the behavioral incidents in the two year period. Finally, the analysis indicated that 2.2% (4) of the student body accounted for 24.4% (98) of all misbehaviors in the school. These four students had 22, 24, 25 and 27 reported incidents of misbehavior over the two year data collection period.

Introduction of the *Second Step Program* produced mixed results for students having six to nine reported incidents. Procedure #1 indicated that for those having six to

nine incidents, seven students had slightly more reported after the introduction of the Program and three had slightly fewer. When Procedure #2 was used, six students had slightly more reported after introduction of the Program and four had slight less. One student in this group left the school.

Procedure #1 indicated that of the students having more than 10 incidents, six exhibited slight increases in misbehavior and two showed slight decreases. When Procedure #2 was used, three showed slight increases in misbehavior and four had slight decreases. One student showed no change. Three students from this group changed schools.

When the Program effects for the four students having the highest number of reported behavioral incidents were examined, Procedure #1 indicated that three had slight increases in reported misbehavior and one had a slight decrease. When Procedure #2 was used, one student showed modest improvement, two exhibited slight increases in misbehavior, and one remained the same.

Regardless of the procedure used, our analysis of the data indicated that student misbehavior increased for students having 6 or more reported incidents of misbehavior during the two year research period. When we attempted to explain the findings, we could think of only the three explanations provided in the previous section.

Student Group Differences. - See Table 3 for the number and percentage of reported misbehaviors for each grade level. When Procedure #1 was used to analyze the data from this Table, we found an increase in misbehavior for four grade levels (Grades 1 [+213.3%], 2 [+325.5%], 3 [+8.4%], &5 [+58.1%]) and a decrease for 2 grade levels (Grades 4 [-19.8%] & 6 [-64.7%]). The Kindergarten had too few episodes to analyze.

Use of Procedure #2 indicated an increase in reported misbehavior for three grade levels (Grades 1[+85.7%], 2 [+122.2%], & 3 [+350.0%]) and a decrease for three other grade levels (Grades 4 [-24.0%], 5 [-13.0%], & 6 [-33.3%]). Again, there were too few

Kindergarten episodes for analysis purposes. It was of interest that after the introduction of the *Second Step Program* that all primary grades had substantial increases in reported misbehavior and all upper elementary grades had modest decreases. A possible reason for this result is that upper elementary students are more able to cope with the cognitive demands of the *Second Step Program.*

Since the data are not longitudinal in nature, we were unable to discern any patterns for the various grade levels.

We analyzed group differences in one additional way, by following a specific cohort group of students over the two year period (e.g., comparing the first and second year behavior of the group of students who were in Grade 3 during the first year of the project and in Grade 4 during the second year).

When we followed a cohort group from one grade level to another using Procedure #1, two cohort groups (K-Grade 1 [+420.0.0%] & Grade 1-Grade 2 [+198.5%]) showed large increases in reported misbehavior, two (Grade 3-Grade 4 [+18.4%] & Grade 4-Grade 5 [+30.3%]) exhibited moderate increases, and two groups (Grade 2-Grade 3 [-291.3%] & Grade 5-Grade 6 [-116.7%]) displayed large decreases.

After the introduction of the *Second Step Program*, only the groups that included Grade 6 students (presumably the oldest students in the school) displayed a decrease in misbehavior when the results from both data analysis procedures were examined. One possible explanation for this finding was that *Second Step* was more effective with students who had a more mature level of cognitive functioning. However, some of the decrease in reported misbehavior for the upper elementary grades might have been due to the transfer of four students who had more that 10 reported incidents and two who had between six and nine incidents.

One might have expected that a cohort group that had a low number of behavioral incidents before the introduction of the *Second Step Program* would have profited more from the program. However, this pattern did not occur.

Finally, although there was a slight tendency for the upper elementary grades to show a decrease of reported misbehavior, that this pattern did not hold true when cohort groups were examined caused us to question whether this finding had any relationship to the introduction of the *Second Step Program.* We believe the data are equivocal.

Types of Misbehavior - We coded reported behavioral incidents into eight categories.

1. **Play related** incidents were those that were obviously the outgrowth of play, or that were reported as such by the staff member and/or the student. The throwing of objects (e.g., snowballs), was included in this category.

2. **Physical aggression** was any altercation in which two or more parties were involved in physical conflict. All parties had to be actively involved in the conflict.

3. **Acts against property** were considered to be any willful action to destroy or steal the property of another.

4. **Rule breaking** was considered to be any incident where a specified rule was broken.

5. **Verbal misbehavior** was considered to be language that was obscene, abusive to others, or out of place for the context in which it was used.

6. **Defiance toward staff** was considered to be an incident where a student refused to comply with the request or directive of a staff member.

7. **Inappropriate sexual behavior**.

8. **Actions with intent to injure** were those in which an individual purposefully attempted to injure another.

Table 4 presents the number of reported incidents for each type misbehavior and the percentage that type represents of the total number incidents. When the number of incidents of each misbehavior type for Year 1 and Year 2 were compared, we found that during Year 2 the number of incidents increased for all types of behaviors. When we compare the incidents reported during Fall 1991 and Spring 1992 (i.e., after the

introduction of the Program), we found that during Spring 1992 the incidence of all types of misbehavior increased (see Table 6, Appendix A). Analyses also indicated that physical aggression toward students was the most often reported form of misbehavior. The second most often reported form was misbehavior related to play (e.g., dangerous play, rough play, throwing objects).

When the data were treated using Procedures #1 and #2, the following trends were found.

1. **Play related.** Procedure #1 showed a 5.5% increase of this form after the introduction of the Program. Procedure #2 indicated that there was a 39.1% decrease.

2. **Physical aggression**. Procedure #1 showed a 37.0% increase and Procedure #2 a 38.2% increase in the number of reported incidents.

3. **Acts against property**. There were few episodes of "acts against property" (i.e., 23 of 401 reported incidents). However, Procedure #1 indicated a 60.0% increase and Procedure #2 a 300.0% increase in such behavior.

4. **Rule breaking**. Again both Procedures indicated increases (i.e., Procedure #1 -- 50.0% & Procedure #2 -- 68.8%).

5. **Verbal misbehavior**. This form of misbehavior increased by 90.5% and 50.0%.

6. **Defiance toward staff**. Both procedures indicated that there was an 11.1% increase.

7. **Inappropriate sexual behavior**. The number of incidents (8) was so small that an analysis was not carried out.

8. **Actions with intent to injure**. There were also few incidents (20) of this form of misbehavior, however, Procedure #1 indicated an increase of 21.3% and Procedure #2 showed it remained the same.

The single decrease found during the *Second Step Program* phase was for "play related" misbehavior, and this decrease was produced only when using Procedure #2. These analyses also indicated that the Program did not reduce the incidence of student misbehavior.

Location and Type of Incident. - During the two years of the project, more (57.4%) incidents of misbehavior were reported for outside the school building than inside

(42.6%). This was true for both the 1990-91 and 1991-92 school years, however, in 1991-92 a somewhat larger percentage of incidents was reported for inside the school building.

The results on Table 4 indicated that 46.3% of all behavioral incidents occurred on the playground. The location with the second highest percentage (24.7%) of misbehavior was the classroom. Since, (1) each of the other eight sites on Table 4 accounted for such small percentages of the reported misbehavior and (2) the playground and the classroom were where the vast majority of outside and inside misbehavior occurred, we focused our remaining data analyses on these two locations.

Use of data analysis Procedure #1 indicated that after the introduction of the *Second Step Program* there was a 49.7% increase in incidents reported for the playground and a 70.2% increase for the classroom. Procedure #2 produced a 61.3% increase for the playground and a 26.1% increase for the classroom. We could not state that the *Second Step Program* was more effective in controlling misbehaviors at any particular location. However, Table 4 shows that, that with the exception of the washroom, after the introduction of the Program there was an increase in the number of incidents at all locations.

Table 5 presents the type of reported misbehavior by location. These data were not analyzed to determine changes that might have resulted from the introduction of the *Second Step Program.* The majority of all types of reported misbehavior happened either on the playground or in the classroom. On the playground, physical aggression (e.g., fighting, kicking, bullying) was the most common type reported. There were 74 incidents reported for the playground, and these represented 49.3% of all incidents reported for that site and 63.8% of all the reported incidents of physical aggression that indicated a location. The next most common form of misbehavior reported for the playground was that related to play. There were 39 misbehaviors of this form reported, and these

represented 26.0% of all incidents reported for the site and 45.9% of all the reported incidents of play misbehavior that indicated a location. Finally, there were 28 incidents of rule breaking reported for the playground. These represented 18.7% of all incidents of misbehavior reported for the site and 38.4% of all the reported incidents of rule breaking that indicated a location.

In classrooms, being rude and defiant to staff was the most common form of reported misbehavior. There were 31 of these incidents. These represented 38.8% of all incidents reported for the site and 63.8% of all the reported incidents of rude and defiant behavior toward staff that indicated a location. The next most common form reported for classrooms was rule breaking. There were 21 incidents reported, and these represented 26.3% of all those reported for the site and 28.8% of all reported rule breaking that indicated a location. Finally, there were 18 incidents of play related misbehavior and 17 incidents of physical aggression reported for the classroom. These represented 22.5% and 21.3% of all incidents of misbehavior reported for the site, and 21.2% and 14.7% of all the reported incidents of play misbehavior and physical aggression that reported a location.

Physical aggression and misbehavior related to play were common to both the playground and classrooms, but a higher number of incidents were reported for the playground. Rule breaking was also common to both sites, but occurred at a proportionally higher rate in classrooms.

Consequences Applied. - The consequence most often applied to misbehavior was missing one recess (see Table 7, Appendix A). Reprimanding the student or calling the student's parents were the second and third most often used consequence. Table 7 shows that the consequences applied to misbehaviors remained quite constant over the two year data collection period. While there were increases in the use of consequences, these

appear to be related to the increase in the number of misbehaviors and not to a change in the use particular consequences.

Staff Survey Data.

The pre- and post-teacher surveys were given to all members of the Primo School. Included were the principal, guidance counsellor, classroom teachers and instructional assistants. The surveys were administered during staff inservice time by the project researchers. Each survey took approximately 45 minutes to complete. The staff members placed their completed surveys in a sealed envelope and gave it to one of the researchers. Staff members were instructed not to place their name on the survey or the envelope.

Pre-Program Staff Survey.

The pre-program survey was administered to the staff on January 24, 1992. A total of 17 staff members turned in completed or partially completed surveys. A copy of the pre-program teacher survey, along with the results, can be found in Appendix B. Of the 17 staff members, 9 (52.9%) had as educators for more than 10 years and no-one had been in the profession for less than a year. Three (17.6%) of the staff had worked at Primo School for less than a year, 7 (41.2%) had worked there between one and three years, and 7 (41.2%) for more than three years. There were not enough subjects in each time category to analyze the affect professional experience had on staff opinion.

School Wide Misbehavior. - When the staff was asked to compare the number of behavioral problems at Primo School with the number at similar schools, 9 (52.9%) reported that they felt Primo had more student behavior problems and 6 (35.3%) stated there were fewer. Two (11.8%) staff members did not respond. The Staff believed that approximately 17.1% of the student population accounted for the majority of the misbehavior. In actuality, the Behavioral Card Data presented above indicated that 12.2% (22) of the school population accounted for 66.1% of the reported misbehavior.

Even more startling, 6.1% (11) of the total student population accounted for 46.4% of all incidents reported.

Behavioral Card data indicated that female students accounted for 5% of all misbehaviors and the staff reported that they thought females accounted for 10%. The main reason stated for the difference between male and female behavior was that "...boys are brought up to be more aggressive than girls" (10 staff members). There were a number of other negative comments made about how boys are socialized and the negative role models they are exposed to. We think this belief affected the handling of a number of incidents reported on the Behavioral Cards. In some instances of what appeared to be male-female altercations or fights, the boys were reprimanded and the girls were not.

On the pre-survey, the staff indicated that physical aggression towards students (16.8%), aggressive play (16.4%) and aggressive communication directed at students (16.2%) accounted for the greatest portion of total misbehavior. Behavioral Card data indicated that 37.4% of all reported misbehavior was related to physical aggression, 23.9% was play related and only 0.8% was verbal in nature.

When asked about the location of misbehavior, the staff indicated that they thought the majority of it occurred on the playground (56.7%). This was slightly higher than the percentage (46.3%) indicated by the Behavioral Card data. The second most common location listed by staff was the classroom (12.5%) and this figure was substantially lower than the Card data showed (24.7%). Other estimates (e.g., washrooms) were quite accurate.

While 94.1% (16) of staff believed that Primo had a set of rules or procedures that govern student behavior, 35.3% (6) felt that not all students were aware of them. Additionally, 64.7% (11) of the staff felt that there were consequences established for rule breaking, but 47.1% (8) stated that not all students were aware of these consequences.

When asked how effective school rules were, 10 (58.8%) staff thought the rules were "somewhat effective", 1 (5.9%) saw them as "somewhat ineffective" and 3 (17.6%) believed that they were "ineffective".

Finally, 10 (58.8%) of the staff felt that school support services and the administration were "effective" or "somewhat effective" in dealing with school behavior problems.

Classroom Misbehavior. - Of the 17 staff members, 10 (58.8%) felt that their classrooms had either "fewer" or "significantly fewer" student behavior problems than did similar classrooms. Five (28.4%) staff members felt that the classrooms they worked in had either "more" or "significantly more" misbehavior than did similar classrooms. These responses were not consistent with those made when the staff was asked to compare misbehavior at Primo School with that of other schools. When answering that question, 53.0% of the staff reported that the school had more misbehavior than similar schools and only 35.3% felt that it had less. However, this response pattern is typical for that question type.

The staff thought that 23.2% of the student body contributed to the majority of the problems. This also was not consistent with the data from the Behavioral Cards. These data indicated that only 12.2% of the school population was responsible for 66.4% of the reported incidents of misbehavior.

The staff identified aggressive play (14.8%), refusal to follow classroom rules (11.9%) and physical aggression toward students (9.1%) as the most common forms of classroom misbehavior. Staff judgment accurately reflected the three most common forms reported on the Behavior Cards, but underestimated the proportion of the total misbehavior represented by each form. Card data indicated that (1) play related behaviors accounted for 22.5%, (2) rule breaking (26.3%), and (3) physical aggression 21.3% of all classroom misbehavior.

Fifteen staff members indicated that there were classroom rules and all but one stated the there were consequences for rule breaking. Fourteen stated that all of their students were aware of the rules and the consequences for rule breaking. When asked to rate the effectiveness of classroom rules, 6 (35.3%) staff members rated the rules as "effective", 7 (41.2%) as only "somewhat effective", and 2 (11.8%) as "somewhat ineffective".

When asked how effective they thought they were in dealing with classroom discipline problems, 7 (41.2%) staff members thought they were "effective" and 9 (52.9%) thought they were "somewhat effective". These responses contradict others found on the questionnaire. No one thought they were "ineffective" in dealing with classroom discipline problems. However, 3 (17.6%) staff members reported that members of the support services team and the administration were "ineffective" in helping them deal with behavior problems in their classrooms.

Student Competencies. - The Primo staff was asked to rate student competencies in the areas of: (a) empathy, (b) social competence, (c) interpersonal problem solving skills, (d) anger management, and (e) controlling impulsive behavior. Thirty to forty percent of the staff thought the student population had little competence in areas (b), (c), (d), and (e). However, 64.0% percent of the staff rated the students as being competent in area (a).

Behavioral Cards. - Most of the staff did not believe the Behavioral Card System was effective in reducing student misbehavior. Only three staff members thought it had a positive affect.

The most common comment (10) made about the Card system was that it helped to document and keep track of student behavior.

When the staff were asked about the affect the Behavioral Card System had on

behavior management, the most common comments were:

1. "students more aware of their behaviors" (5);
2. "a good way of tracking the behaviors" (4);
3. "I feel they (the students) think it is a fair system" (4); and,
4. "can review student behavior at any time" (3).

Post-Program Staff Survey

The post-program staff survey was administered on June 30, 1992. Sixteen staff members returned either completed or partially completed surveys. One less survey was filled out on the post-program survey than on the pre-program survey because an instructional assistant had left the school. The same procedures were used to administer the post-survey as the pre-survey. A copy of the post-program staff survey and the results are presented in Appendix C.

School Wide Misbehavior. - Eight (50.0%) staff members thought there were "fewer student behavior problems" after the introduction of the *Second Step Program.* Six (37.5%) felt that "no change in the number of student behavior problems" had occurred. Analyses of the Behavioral Card data with both Procedure #1 and #2 found increased (44.0% & 20.4%) student misbehavior. A possible explanation for this finding was that because of staff sensitization they reported more misbehavior than was actually occurring.

Of the eight staff members who indicated that the number of behavior problems had decreased, three stated that the changes were not the result of the *Second Step Program* and two stated that they were. Three did not respond to the question.

Six staff members (37.5%) stated that the *Second Step Program* was equally effective for males and females. Two (12.5%) felt that it was more effective for males and two (12.5%) felt that it was more effective for females. Six staff members did not

respond to the question. The results are obviously equivocal. Analysis of the Behavioral Card data showed no effect for either group.

Five (31.3%) of the 16 staff members stated that they felt the school rules had changed as a result of the *Second Step Program* and nine (56.3%) felt that they did not change. Two (12.4%) did not respond to the question. All five who felt that a rule change had taken place, also noted that the new rules had been "somewhat effective" in dealing with student misbehavior. These responses are not consistent with those to a previous question. On that question only two staff members felt that the *Second Step Program* accounted for reductions in student misbehavior.

The Primo staff was given a list of 15 student misbehaviors and asked to indicate whether the misbehaviors had increased, stayed the same or decreased in the school population after the introduction of the *Second Step Program.* This question caused response problems and we were unable to analyze the data as intended. However, the vast majority of staff responses noted that the introduction of the *Second Step Program* had no affect on student behavior. Those few responses that noted some change, portray it as more positive than negative. See Appendix C (Question 6) for these data.

Behavioral Card data did not match teacher perceptions. Analysis Procedure #1 showed that after the introduction of the *Second Step Program* all categories of misbehavior increased. Procedure #2 revealed increases in six of the categories, no change in the actions with intent to injure category, and a reduction in the aggressive behavior category.

Classroom Misbehavior. - Four (25.0%) staff members thought that student misbehavior in the classroom had decreased since the introduction of the *Second Step Program* and three (18.8%) others felt that it had increased. Six (37.5%) noted no change in the number of misbehaviors. When Procedures #1 and #2 were used to analyze the B ehavior Card data, both revealed increases in the incidence of classroom misbehavior.

Of the staff members who stated that changes had occurred, only one thought the changes resulted from the *Second Step Program.* Five of the other 16 respondents felt that the changes were not related to the Program. Ten staff members did not respond to the question.

Six staff members (37.5%) stated that there had been changes made in classroom rules as a result of the *Second Step Program.* Five of the six noted that the rule changes had either been "effective" or "somewhat effective" in dealing with misbehavior. Again, the responses do not correspond with those to previous questions.

The list of 15 misbehaviors was again given to the staff and they were asked to indicated whether the misbehaviors had increased, stayed the same or decreased in their classroom since the introduction of the *Second Step Program.* Only the classroom teachers responded to this question. Of the 120 responses related to these forms of misbehavior, 98 (81.7%) indicated that no change had occurred in the incidence of misbehavior. Fourteen (63.6%) of the 22 responses stated increases had occurred. Five (22.7%) of the 22 reported increases and decreases were attributed to the introduction of the *Second Step Program.* All five of these attributions were decreases. We found no pattern for the reported increases and decreases. Again, the vast majority of the responses did not attribute student behavior change to the introduction of the *Second Step Program.* See Appendix C (Question 14) for these data.

The Primo staff were asked whether the Program had improved student competence in the areas of: (a) empathy, (b) social competence, (c) interpersonal problem solving skills, (d) anger management, and (e) controlling impulsive behavior. Between 50.0% and 62.5% of the staff did not respond to some parts of this question. Of the responses provided, few indicated that the staff perceived improvement in student competence.

When staff members were asked whether their ability to deal with student misbehavior had changed as a result of the *Second Step Program,* seven (43.8%) stated

that they had become "more effective" and six (37.5%) reported that their "effectiveness had not changed". Three staff members (18.8%) did not respond to the question. Six of the staff who stated that they had become "more effective" were classroom teachers and one was an instructional aide. The "more effective" responses seem to contradicted those from a previous question. To that question, staff members responded there was no change in the incidence student misbehavior, in their classroom, after the introduction of the Program.

Next, they were asked if they would recommend that the *Second Step Program* be continued at Primo Elementary School. Twelve (75.0%) said "yes" and one (6.3%) stated "no". When asked to provide a rationale for their recommendation, eight stated that more time was needed to determine whether the program was effective.

Finally, 10 (62.5%) of the 16 staff members stated that they would recommend the *Second Step Program* to other schools and one (6.3%) stated they would not. The other five staff members (31.3%) did not respond to the question. There was no pattern with regard to why they would recommend the Program.

When we examined the survey data we found a number of inconsistencies. Perhaps the main one was that most of the staff responses indicated they felt the Program had little affect on student behavior, yet they recommended that it be continued and expanded to other schools. However, many staff members qualified their recommendation by stating more time was needed for program evaluation.

Checklist Data.

At the start of the *Second Step Program*, classroom teachers were given checklists for all lessons and videos. Once a lesson was taught, the classroom teacher completed the appropriate checklist and returned it in a sealed envelope. Teachers were asked not to place their name on the checklist or envelope. There were three sets of checklists developed. One set was developed for Kindergarten, one for Grades 1-3 and one for

Grades 4-6. Since the sets were each approximately 70 pages in length, they were not included in the report. Copies of the checklists may be obtained from the authors of the report.

Kindergarten Checklist Results.

As Primo school had only one Kindergarten teacher, the results presented below are the opinions of only one teacher.

Unit I: Empathy Training. - Lessons 1-12 were taught to the Kindergarten students. Each lesson took between 10 and 20 minutes to complete. The average completion time was 15 minutes.

At the beginning of this Unit, a parent letter was sent home.

Teacher ratings indicated that all lessons had: (1) goals and accompanying materials that were appropriate for Kindergarten students; (2) materials that adequately prepared the teacher to deliver the lesson; (3) a logical sequence to them; (4) allocated an adequate amount of time; (5) provided adequate time for the students to practice the skills being taught; (6) kept the students actively involved; and, (7) materials that motivated the students.

The teacher noted that Lessons 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 provided adequate materials for making judgment about student performance, but that such was not the case for Lessons 2, 9, 10, 11 and 12.

The teacher thought that Lessons 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 adequately informed students of their performance and progress, but that Lessons 2 and 12 did not.

With the exception of Lesson 4, all lessons were rated as having accomplished the listed goals. Lesson 4 was rated as not having accomplished the listed goals, and the teacher reported having tried to make lesson modifications to correct for this problem. This lesson was the only one given a "below average" overall rating by the teacher.

Lessons 2, 3, 6, 8 and 10 were given overall ratings of "very good" and were thought to have produced "minor positive change" in student behavior. Lessons 1, 5, 7, 9, 11 and 12 were rated "average". Lessons 1, 7 and 11 were perceived as having produced "minor positive change" in student behavior, and Lessons 5, 9 and 12 were thought to have produced "no change".

Unit II: Impulse Control. - Lessons 1, 2, 3 and 5 were taught to the Kindergarten students. Each lesson took between 15 and 20 minutes to complete. The average completion time was 16 minutes.

At the beginning of the Unit a parent letter was sent home.

Teacher ratings indicated that the lessons had: (1) goals and accompanying materials that were appropriate for Kindergarten students; (2) materials that adequately prepared the teacher to deliver the lesson; (3) a logical sequence to them; (4) allocated an adequate amount of time; (5) kept the students actively involved; and (6) materials that motivated the students.

The teacher thought Lessons 2, 3 and 5 provided adequate time for students to practice the skills being taught, but that Lesson 1 did not.

Lessons 1, 2, 3 and, 5 were perceived as not providing quality materials for making judgments about student performance and as inadequately informing students of their performance and progress.

With the exception of Lesson 1, the teacher rated the lessons as having accomplished their listed goals. Lesson 1 was the only lesson given a "below average" rating.

Lessons 2, 3 and 5 were rated as "average", but as having had no affect on student behavior.

Summary. - Eight of the 16 lessons were thought to have had a positive affect on student behavior. The remaining lessons were perceived as having no effect on student

behavior. Two lessons in the Kindergarten Units were rated as being of "below average" quality.

Grades 1-3 Checklist Results.

Four teachers (i.e., Grades 1, 2, 2-3, & 4) completed checklists for the Grades 1-3 Units of the Program. The Grade 2-3 split was a Behavioral Adjustment classroom. The classroom contained students who were considered behavioral problems. This room had a lower teacher-student ratio and there was an instructional assistant assigned to it.

Unit I: Empathy Training. - Lessons 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7 were taught in all the classrooms. Each lesson took between 15 and 45 minutes to complete. The average completion time was approximately 20 minutes.

The video was shown between after Lesson 2. Teachers reported spending between 5 and 30 minutes discussing the video with their students. The average time reported was 16 minutes. All four of the teachers rated the video as: being of very good quality; appropriate for their students' level of development; and well organized.

Only two of the four teachers chose to send the letters home to their students' parents.

With the exception of Lesson 4, which was rated as "very poor" by the Grade 2-3 teacher, all lessons were perceived as either "very good" or "average" by the four teachers. Lessons 1, 5, 6 and 7 were rated highest (i.e., 3 "very good" ratings and 1 "average").

Two teachers rated Lessons 2, 4 and 5 as having produced "minor positive change" in student behavior. All other lessons were rated as having produced "no change".

It appeared that the Behavior Adjustment classroom (i.e., Grade 2-3) had the most difficulty Unit I, lessons. This was particularly true for Lessons 2 and 4.

The Grade 2 teacher noted that Lessons 5 and 6 did not provide adequate time for students to learn the lesson or practice the skills being taught. This teacher also noted that Lesson 7 did keep students actively involved.

The Grade 1 teacher thought that Lesson 2 did not adequately evaluate student performance.

Unit II: Impulse Control. - Lessons 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9 and 10 were taught in all classrooms. Each lesson took between 15 and 40 minutes to complete. The average completion time was approximately 30 minutes.

The video was shown to the students after Lesson 5. Five to 25 minutes were spent discussing the video. The average discussion time was 13 minutes. Two of the four teachers rated the video as "very good" and one rated it as "average". The other teacher did not respond to the question. All four teachers stated that it was appropriate for their students' level of development.

Only one of the teachers chose to send a letter to their students' parents.

With the exception of Lesson 1, which received a "very poor" rating from the Grade 2 teacher, all lessons were given either "very good" or "average" ratings. Lessons 5, 8 and 9 were rate highest (i.e., 3 "very good" & 1 "average").

One teacher rated Lesson 9 as having produced "major positive change" in student behavior and 3 teachers rated it as having caused "minor positive change".

Two teachers rated Lesson 8 as having brought about "minor positive change" in student behavior.

Lesson 9, Interrupting Politely, was perceived as producing the most positive change in student behavior.

With the exception of Lesson 1, few negative comments were made about the lessons. The Grade 2 teacher reported that their students had great difficulty with Lesson 1.

All four teachers stated that Lesson 3 did not provide adequate practice time for their students. The Grade 1 and 2 teachers felt the lesson did not keep their students actively involved.

Finally, the teacher of the Behavior Adjustment Class noted that Lessons 4 and 5 did not adequately evaluate the performance of their students.

Unit III: Anger Management. - Lessons 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8 and 9 were taught in all but one classroom. In this classroom, the teacher did not teach Lessons 5, 8, and 9.

Each lesson took between 10 and 45 minutes to complete. The average completion time was about 30 minutes.

The video was to be shown after Lesson 5. Two teachers did not show the video. One class spent 3 minutes discussing the video and the other spent 15 minutes. Both of the teachers who showed the video rated it as being "very good" and thought it was appropriate for their students' level of development.

Two of the four teachers sent letters to their students' parents.

With the exception of the Lessons 5 and 9, all lessons were rated as "very good" or "average" by the teachers. Lesson 4 was rated highest (i.e., 4 "very good"). The Grade 1 teacher rated Lessons 5 and 9 as being of "below average" quality.

The Grade 1 and Grade 2 teachers thought Lesson 4 had produced "minor positive change" in their students' behavior. The other teacher thought it produced no change.

Lesson 2 was viewed as having produced "major positive change" by the Grade 3 teacher and a "minor positive change" by the Grade 2 teacher. The other teachers noted no changes resulted from Lesson 2.

The Grade 1 teacher thought Lesson 5 had produced "minor negative change" in students. The three other teachers thought this lesson had produced no changes in student behavior.

All four teachers indicated the other lessons had no affect on student behavior.

The Grade 1 teacher noted that students had difficulty with the organization and materials for Lessons 5 and 9. The organization and materials for all other lessons were rated from "average" to "very good" by all teachers.

Summary. - At least one teacher rated the overall quality of four of the 21 lessons was rated as "below average". When problems were noted, they seemed particular to a given grade level. No lesson was rated as "poor" by more than one teacher.

Of the 21 lessons, teachers rated only 8 as having had a positive affect on student behavior. All four teachers thought Lesson 9 of Unit II had a positive affect on student behavior. Only 1 or 2 teachers rated any of the other 6 lessons as having a positive affect. One teacher thought Lesson 5, Unit III, had a negative affect on the students. No teacher thought any of the other 13 lessons had an impact on student behavior.

Grades 4-6 Checklist Results.

All three teachers completed checklists for the Grade 4-6 Units of the Program. One teacher skipped Lesson 7 of Unit I and discontinued the Program after Lesson 8 of that Unit. The other two teachers did not return checklists for Unit III. We do not know if they discontinued the Program after Unit II or whether they just failed to return the checklists.

Unit I: Empathy Training. - Lessons 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 12 were taught in all classrooms. Each lesson took between 20 and 40 minutes to complete. The average completion time was approximately 30 minutes.

The video was shown to the students after Lesson 2. Teachers spent approximately 5 minutes discussing the video with their students. All three teachers rated the video as being of "very good" overall quality and appropriate for their students' level of development.

All three teachers sent letters home to their students' parents.

All lessons except Lessons 3 and 8 were evaluated by all teachers as either "average" or "very good". Lessons 4 and 12 were rated highest (i.e., 2 "very good" & 1 "average"). Lesson 3 was rated "below average" by one teacher and Lesson 8 received two "below average" ratings.

Lessons 3, 6, 7 and 8 each had one rating that indicated it had produced "minor positive change" in student behavior. Other ratings of these lessons noted "no change" had occurred. The three teachers rated all other lessons as having had no impact on student behavior.

The Grade 5 teacher reported that Lessons 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8 and 12 failed to keep students actively involved.

The Grade 5 teacher stated that none of the lessons met student evaluation requirements and the Grade 4 teacher made similar statements about Lessons 3, 4, 7, 8, and 12.

The Grade 4 teacher thought Lesson 3 was not appropriate for the developmental level of their students.

The Grade 6 teacher noted that Lesson 8 was not appropriate for the developmental of level of their students.

Unit II: Impulse Control. - Lessons 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 10 and 11 were taught in only two classrooms. As previously mentioned, one teacher did not teach Unit II of the Program. Each lesson took 30 to 60 minutes to compelte. The average completion time was approximately 40 minutes. One teacher mentioned that they thought the lessons took too much time. We do not know why one teacher discontinued the Program, but time might have been a factor.

The video was shown to the students after Lesson 5. One teacher spent 5 minutes discussing the video and the second teacher spent 10 minutes. Both teachers rated the

video as being of "very good" overall quality and appropriate for their students' level of development.

Both teachers sent letters to their students' parents.

With the exception of Lesson 1, which was rated as "very poor" by the Grade 5 teacher and Lesson 2, which received "very poor" ratings from the Grade 4 teacher, all lessons were rated as either being of "very good" or "average" overall quality. The Grade 5 teacher reported "minor positive changes" in student behavior for the following sub-goals: (a) evaluating possible solutions for consequences (Lesson 4); (b) choosing a solution (Lesson 4); (c) breaking down a solution into the skill steps necessary to apply the solution (Lesson 5); and (d) keeping a promise (Lesson 7). All remaining lessons were rated by the Grade 5 teacher as having produced "no change" in student behavior. The Grade 4 teacher did not think any lesson had an impact on student behavior.

The Grade 5 teacher noted that Lesssons 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, and 10 did not actively involve their students.

None of the lessons were rated as adequately evaluating the performance of Grade 4 or Grade 5 students. Both teachers also noted that the lessons did not inform students about their performance or progress.

Lessons 1, 3 and 9 were rated as being inappropriate for the developmental level of Grade 5 students.

Summary. - Four of the 19 lessons for Grades 4-6 were given "below average" ratings by at least one teacher. None of the lessons were rated as being poor by more than one teacher. When judging student outcomes, the Grade 5 teacher thought Lesson 4 of Unit II had produced "minor positive changes" and the Grade 6 teacher felt Lessons 3, 6, and 8 of Unit I had done the same. The teachers thought the remaining 15 lessons had no affect on student behavior. As none of the teachers returned checklists for Unit III, we can not comment on the quality of the lessons or the impact they had on student behavior.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

When the reported number of incidents of misbehavior for Year 1 and Year 2 were examined, the following results were found.

1. The total number of behavioral incidents reported at Primo School increased during the second year of the project.

2. The majority of Primo students did not have any reported incidents of misbehavior.

3. The majority of the students reported for misbehavior had only 1 or 2 incidents.

4. Twenty-two (12.6%) of the total school population accounted for 66.1% of all reported incidents, 11 (6.3%) accounted for 46.4% of those reported, and 4 (2.2%) were responsible for 24.4% of the total.

5. Ninety-five percent of all reported incidents of misbehavior involved male students.

We believe that the best explanation for the increase in reported misbehavior during Year 2 was that the initiation of the research project in Fall 1991 sensitized the staff to student misbehavior and resulted in their becoming "hyper-vigilant" in reporting such behavior. The introduction of the Second Step Program might have further increased both of these phenomena during Spring 1992.

When we analyzed the data to evaluate the effects of the *Second Step Program*, we found the following results.

1. Both Procedures #1 and #2 indicated an increase (i.e., 44.0% & 20.4%) in the total number of reported misbehaviors for the period after the introduction of the *Second Step Program*.

2. When the two Procedures were used to examine the behavior of students with 6 or more reported incidents, both showed more students had increases (i.e., Procedure #1 indicated 13 increases & Procedure #2 showed 9) than decreases (i.e., Procedure #1 showed 5 decreases & Procedure #2 indicated 8) for the period after the introduction of the Program. One student showed no change when using Procedure #2.

3. When a comparison of grade level behavior was made, Procedure #1 showed increases in reported misbehavior for Grades 1 (213.3%), 2 (325.5%), 3 (8.4%), and 5 (58.1%) and decreases for Grades 4 (-19.8%) and 6 (-64.7%). Procedure #2 indicated increases for Grades 1 (85.7%), 2 (122.2%) and 3 (350.0%) and decreases for Grades 4 (-24.0%), 5 (-13.0%) and 6 (-33.3%). So

few incidents (2) were reported for the Kindergarten class that analysis was not undertaken.

4. When the data were examined for cohort groups (e.g., those students who were in Grade 5 in 1990-91 and in Grade 6 in 1991-92), only Procedure #1 could be used. It showed that 4 groups (i.e., K-Grade 1, Grade 1-2, Grade 3-4, & Grade 4-5) had moderate to large increases in reported incidents and 2 groups (Grade 2-3 & Grade 5-6) had large decreases.

5. Our analyses of group data found that only one group (i.e., either grade level or cohort) showed a decrease in misbehavior regardless of Procedure used. That group was the one that contained Grade 6 students, presumably the oldest students in the school.

6. When the data were examined for increases or decreases by misbehavior type, all types but play related showed increases regardless of the Procedure used. Play related showed an increase when Procedure #1 was used and a decrease when Procedure #2 was used.

7. Location data were examined to see if the Program produced decreased misbehavior at any particular site. Regardless of analytic procedure used we found only site increases.

8. On the Post-Program Staff Survey, the vast majority of the responses given by the Primo staff indicated that no change in student behavior had resulted from the introduction of the *Second Step Program*. There were, however, more responses that indicated "slight positive" gains than "negative" ones.

9. Even though Checklist data showed that most teachers rated the overall quality of the Program lessons as either "very good" or "average", teacher comments about student outcomes indicated that the Program had little affect on student behavior.

The two procedures used for analysis purposes attempted to account for increases in reported misbehavior due to staff sensitization. However, both examinations of the Card data indicated that the *Second Step Program* did not cause a reduction in the number misbehaviors reported. Analyses of data from the Post-Program Survey and the Checklists produced similar findings.

When we compared data collected before Program implementation with data collected afterwards, we found: (a) an increase in the total number of misbehaviors; (b) increased reports of misbehavior for the majority of the students with 6 or more incidents; (c) 11 increases in the incidence of group misbehavior (i.e., both cohort and grade level) and 7 decreases in group misbehavior; (d) that the incidence increased for all forms of

misbehavior (e.g., play related, physical aggression, etc.); (e) that misbehavior increased for both outside and inside school locations; (f) that the vast majority of staff responses indicated the Program did not have an affect on student behavior; (g) that Checklist data showed most teachers rated the overall quality of the Program lessons as either "very good" or "average", and (h) teacher comments about Program outcomes indicated it had little affect on student behavior.

There were, however, some indications (i.e., 6 of 9 analyses of cohort group and grade level Card data indicated decreases in misbehavior) that the Program might be effective for students in the upper elementary grades. However, when Checklist data were analyzed, we found that after partial completion of Unit I one of the upper elementary teachers had discontinued the Program. Furthermore, we found that the group this teacher taught accounted for half (3) of the group decreases noted. Also, the other upper elementary teachers did not return checkllists for Unit III. We do not know if they taught this unit. As a result, it was difficult to attribute decreased misbehavior in upper elementary student groups to the Program.

The finding that the *Second Step Program* appeared to have had no affect or even a somewhat negative effect on student behavior, might have been due to the length of time the Program was run. Eight staff responses noted that the Program needed to be run longer to have an impact on student behavior. Additionally, though the majority of teachers reported no change in the incidence of misbehavior in their classrooms, six thought they had become "more effective in dealing with student misbehavior." These findings, when taken together, might explain why even though teachers did not attribute changes in student behavior to the introduction of the Program, they thought it should be continued.

At best, we found the data to be equivocal. In many instances the data indicated that the Program had no affect, or even a negative one on student behavior. As a result, we recommend that the *Second Step Program* be examined over a longer period of time before introducing it in other schools.

APPENDIX A

Behavioral Card Data

Table 1
Total Number Of Incidents By Year And Gender

GENDER	YEAR SEPT-DEC 1990	JAN-JUNE 1991	SEPT-DEC 1991	JAN-JUNE 1992	TOTAL # of INCIDENTS
MALE	88 (23.1%)*	68 (17.8%)	101 (26.5%)	124 (32.5%)	381 (95.0%)+
FEMALE	4 (20.0%)	3 (15.0%)	7 (35.0%)	6 (30.0%)	20 (5.0%)
TOTALS	92 (22.9%)	71 (17.7%)	108 (26.9%)	130 (32.4%)	401

* Percentages based on row totals.
\+ Percentages based on column totals.

Table 2
Total Number Of Incidents By Year And Individual Students

INDIVIDUAL STUDENT	YEAR SEPT-DEC 1990	JAN-JUNE 1991	SEPT-DEC 1991	JAN-JUNE 1992	TOTAL # of INCIDENTS
01	1 (16.7%)*	2 (33.3%)	2 (33.3%)	1 (16.7%)	6 (1.5%)+
02	0	0	1 (100.0%)	0	1 (0.2%)
03	0	0	1 (100.0%)	0	1 (0.2%)
04	0	0	1 (50.0%)	1 (50.0%)	2 (0.5%)
05	0	0	1 (14.3%)	6 (85.7%)	7 (1.7%)
06	0	0	1 (100.0%)	0	1 (0.2%)
07	3 (12.5%)	3 (12.5%)	8 (33.3%)	10 (41.7%)	24 (6.0%)
08	0	0	1 (25.0%)	3 (75.0%)	4 (1.0%)
09	0	0	1 (100.0%)	0	1 (0.2%)
10	0	0	7 (58.3%)	5 (41.7%)	12 (3.0%)
11	0	0	1 (100.0%)	0	1 (0.2%)
12	1 (20.0%)	1 (20.0%)	3 (60.0%)	0	5 (1.2%)
13	1 (3.7%)	4 (14.8%)	14 (51.9%)	8 (29.6%)	27 (6.7%)
14	0	0	1 (11.1%)	8 (88.9%)	9 (2.2%)
15	0	0	1 (100.0%)	0	1 (0.2%)
16	2 (40.0%)	0	2 (40.0%)	1 (20.0%)	5 (1.2%)
17	0	0	2 (50.0%)	2 (50.0%)	4 (1.0%)
18	0	0	1 (33.3%)	2 (66.7%)	3 (0.7%)
19	0	1 (50.0%)	1 (50.0%)	0	2 (0.5%)
20	0	0	2 (40.0%)	3 (60.0%)	5 (1.2%)

Table 2 (Cont.)

INDIVIDUAL STUDENT	YEAR SEPT-DEC 1990	JAN-JUNE 1991	SEPT-DEC 1991	JAN-JUNE 1992	TOTAL # of INCIDENTS
21	3 (33.3%)	1 (11.1%)	1 (11.1%)	4 (44.4%)	9 (2.2%)
22	0	0	2 (50.0%)	2 (50.0%)	4 (1.0%)
23	4 (33.3%)	0	3 (25.0%)	5 (41.7%)	12 (3.0%)
24	2 (28.6%)	0	3 (42.9%)	2 (28.6%)	7 (1.7%)
25	6 (27.3%)	1 (4.5%)	7 (31.8%)	8 (36.4%)	22 (5.5%)
26	0	0	3 (60.0%)	2 (40.0%)	5 (1.2%)
27	1 (16.7%)	0	4 (66.7%)	1 (16.7%)	6 (1.5%)
28	0	1 (25.0%)	3 (75.0%)	0	4 (1.0%)
29	0	3 (20.0%)	8 (53.3%)	4 (26.7%)	15 (3.7%)
30	0	0	2 (66.7%)	1 (33.3%)	3 (0.7%)
31	0	0	1 (100.0%)	0	1 (0.2%)
32	0	0	1 (100.0%)	0	1 (0.2%)
33	0	0	1 (100.0%)	0	1 (0.2%)
34	1 (11.1%)	3 (33.3%)	4 (44.4%)	1 (11.1%)	9 (2.2%)
35	11 (44.0%)	6 (24.0%)	4 (16.0%)	4 (16.0%)	25 (6.2%)
36	1 (12.5%)	0	2 (25.0%)	5 (62.5%)	8 (2.0%)
37	2 (33.3%)	0	1 (16.7%)	3 (50.0%)	6 (1.5%)
38	3 (75.0%)	0	1 (25.0%)	0	4 (1.0%)
39	1 (9.1%)	5 (45.5%)	4 (36.4%)	1 (9.1%)	11 (2.7%)
40	0	0	1 (100.0%)	0	1 (0.2%)

Table 2 (Cont.)

INDIVIDUAL STUDENT	YEAR				TOTAL # of INCIDENTS
	SEPT-DEC 1990	JAN-JUNE 1991	SEPT-DEC 1991	JAN-JUNE 1992	
41	1 (100.0%)	0	0	0	1 (0.2%)
42	0	2 (100.0%)	0	0	2 (0.5%)
43	9 (60.0%)	6 (40.0%)	0	0	15 (3.7%)
44	0	1 (100.0%)	0	0	1 (0.2%)
45	1 (20.0%)	2 (40.0%)	0	2 (40.0%)	5 (1.2%)
46	0	1 (20.0%)	0	4 (80.0%)	5 (1.2%)
47	0	1 (100.0%)	0	0	1 (0.2%)
48	2 (100.0%)	0	0	0	2 (0.5%)
49	8 (72.7%)	3 (27.3%)	0	0	11 (2.7%)
51	0	2 (100.0%)	0	0	2 (0.5%)
52	1 (33.3%)	2 (66.7%)	0	0	3 (0.7%)
53	2 (66.7%)	1 (33.3%)	0	0	3 (0.7%)
54	0	1 (50.0%)	0	1 (50.0%)	2 (0.5%)
55	1 (50.0%)	0	0	1 (50.0%)	2 (0.5%)
56	1 (100.0%)	0	0	0	1 (0.2%)
57	1 (33.3%)	2 (66.7%)	0	0	3 (0.7%)
58	7 (58.3%)	5 (41.7%)	0	0	12 (3.0%)
59	0	1 (50.0%)	0	1 (50.0%)	2 (0.5%)
60	1 (50.0%)	1 (50.0%)	0	0	2 (0.5%)

Table 2 (Cont.)

INDIVIDUAL STUDENT	YEAR SEPT-DEC 1990	JAN-JUNE 1991	SEPT-DEC 1991	JAN-JUNE 1992	TOTAL # of INCIDENTS
61	0	1 (100.0%)	0	0	1 (0.2%)
62	1 (100.0%)	0	0	0	1 (0.2%)
63	1 (100.0%)	0	0	0	1 (0.2%)
64	1 (100.0%)	0	0	0	1 (0.2%)
65	3 (100.0%)	0	0	0	3 (0.7%)
66	2 (100.0%)	0	0	0	2 (0.5%)
67	3 (100.0%)	0	0	0	3 (0.7%)
68	1 (100.0%)	0	0	0	1 (0.2%)
69	2 (33.3%)	4 (66.7%)	0	0	6 (1.5%)
70	0	3 (100.0%)	0	0	3 (0.7%)
71	0	1 (100.0%)	0	0	1 (0.2%)
72	0	0	0	6 (100.0%)	6 (1.5%)
73	0	0	0	4 (100.0%)	4 (1.0%)
74	0	0	0	1 (100.0%)	1 (0.2%)
75	0	0	0	2 (100.0%)	2 (0.5%)
76	0	0	0	1 (100.0%)	1 (0.2%)
77	0	0	0	1 (100.0%)	1 (0.2%)
78	0	0	0	2 (100.0%)	2 (0.5%)
79	0	0	0	2 (100.0%)	2 (0.5%)
80	0	0	0	1 (100.0%)	1 (0.2%)

Table 2 (Cont.)

INDIVIDUAL STUDENT	YEAR SEPT-DEC 1990	JAN-JUNE 1991	SEPT-DEC 1991	JAN-JUNE 1992	TOTAL # of INCIDENTS
81	0	0	0	1 (100.0%)	1 (0.2%)
82	0	0	0	1 (100.0%)	1 (0.2%)
83	0	0	0	2 (100.0%)	2 (0.5%)
84	0	0	0	1 (100.0%)	1 (0.2%)
85	0	0	0	1 (100.0%)	1 (0.2%)
86	0	0	0	1 (100.0%)	1 (0.2%)
87	0	0	0	1 (100.0%)	1 (0.2%)
TOTALS	92 (22.9%)	71 (17.7%)	108 (26.9%)	130 (32.4%)	401

* Percentages based on row totals.
\+ Percentages based on column totals.

Table 3
Total Number Of Incidents By Year And Grade Level

GRADE LEVEL	YEAR SEPT-DEC 1990	JAN-JUNE 1991	SEPT-DEC 1991	JAN-JUNE 1992	TOTAL # of INCIDENTS
Kindergarten	1 (50.0%)*	0	0	1 (50.0%)	2 (0.5%)+
1	8 (15.7%)	3 (5.9%)	14 (27.5%)	26 (51.0%)	51 (13.2%)
2	1 (2.9%)	4 (11.8%)	9 (26.5%)	20 (58.8%)	34 (8.8%)
3	15 (42.9%)	9 (25.7%)	2 (5.7%)	9 (25.7%)	35 (9.1%)
4	27 (30.0%)	19 (21.1%)	25 (27.8%)	19 (21.1%)	90 (23.4%)
5	12 (10.3%)	18 (15.5%)	46 (39.7%)	40 (34.5%)	116 (30.1%)
6	25 (43.9%)	17 (29.8%)	9 (15.8%)	6 (10.5%)	57 (14.8%)
TOTALS	89 (23.1%)	70 (18.2%)	105 (27.3%)	121 (31.4%)	385++

* Percentages based on row totals.
\+ Percentages based on column totals.
++ Grade level data missing for 16 students.

Table 4
Total Number Of Incidents By Year And Behavior

BEHAVIORAL CATEGORIES	YEAR SEPT-DEC 1990	JAN-JUNE 1991	SEPT-DEC 1991	JAN-JUNE 1992	TOTAL # of INCIDENTS
RELATED TO PLAY					
dangerous to self	0	0	9 (100.0%)	0	9 (2.2%)+
dangerous to others	1 (2.7%)*	5 (13.5%)	22 (24.3%)	9 (24.3%)	37 (9.2%)
rough play	7 (38.9%)	1 (5.6%)	2 (11.1%)	8 (44.4%)	18 (9.2%)
play	0	4 (40.0%)	3 (30.0%)	3 (30.0%)	10 (2.5%)
throwing objects	7 (31.8%)	3 (13.6%)	7 (31.8%)	5 (22.7%)	22 (5.5%)
TOTAL					**96 (23.9%)++**
PHYSICAL AGGRESSION					
fighting	25 (22.1%)	31 (27.4%)	24 (21.2%)	33 (29.2%)	113 (28.2%)
fighting with injury	1 (9.1%)	2 (18.2%)	4 (36.4%)	4 (36.4%)	11 (2.7%)
kicking	2 (11.1%)	2 (11.1%)	5 (27.8%)	9 (50.0%)	18 (4.5%)
bullying	4 (50.0%)	2 (25.0%)	1 (12.5%)	1 (12.5%)	8 (2.0%)
TOTAL					**150 (37.4%)**
ACTS AGAINST PROPERTY					
school	6 (46.2%)	1 (7.7%)	0	6 (46.2%)	13 (3.2%)
student	4 (50.0%)	2 (25.0%)	2 (25.0%)	0	8 (2.0%)
stealing	0	0	0	2 (100.0%)	2 (0.5%)
TOTAL					**23 (5.7%)**

Table (Cont.)

BEHAVIORAL CATEGORIES	YEAR SEPT-DEC 1990	JAN-JUNE 1991	SEPT-DEC 1991	JAN-JUNE 1992	TOTAL # of INCIDENTS
RULE BREAKING					
school rules	8 (42.1%)*	3 (15.8%)	3 (15.8%)	5 (26.3%)	19 (4.7%)+
skipping classes	4 (44.4%)	4 (44.4%)	0	1 (11.1%)	9 (2.2%)
classroom rules	6 (40.0%)	0	4 (26.7%)	5 (33.3%)	15 (33.3%)
annoying others	7 (18.4%)	7 (18.4%)	8 (21.1%)	16 (42.1%)	38 (9.5%)
temper tantrums	0	1 (50.0%)	1 (50.0%)	0	2 (0.5%)
TOTAL					**83 (20.7%)++**
VERBAL MISBEHAVIOR					
towards staff	2 (28.6%)	0	3 (42.9%)	2 (28.6%)	7 (1.7%)
towards students	2 (15.4%)	2 (15.4%)	2 (15.4%)	7 (53.8%)	13 (3.2%)
obscene language	3 (30.0%)	2 (20.0%)	2 (20.0%)	3 (30.0%)	10 (2.5%)
yelling	0	0	1 (100.0%)	0	1 (0.2%)
TOTAL					**31 (0.8%)**
DEFIANCE TOWARD STAFF	26 (35.1%)	10 (13.5%)	18 (24.3%)	20 (27.0%)	74 (18.5%)
TOTAL					**74 (18.5%)**

Table 4 (Cont.)

BEHAVIORAL CATEGORIES	YEAR SEPT-DEC 1990	JAN-JUNE 1991	SEPT-DEC 1991	JAN-JUNE 1992	TOTAL # of INCIDENTS
SEXUAL BEHAVIOR	2 (25.0%)*	0	1 (12.5%)	5 (62.5%)	8 (2.0%)+
TOTAL					**8 (2.0%)++**
ACTIONS WITH INTENT TO INJURE					
against students	6 (31.6%)	2 (10.5%)	6 (31.6%)	5 (26.3%)	19 (4.7%)
hitting a teacher	0	0	0	1 (100.0%)	1 (0.2%)
TOTAL					**20 (5.0%)**
GRAND TOTALS	**92 (22.9%)**	**71 (17.7%)**	**108 (26.9%)**	**130 (32.4%)**	**401**

* Percentages based on row totals.
\+ Percentages based on column totals.
++ Percentages base on Grand Total of 401.

Table 5
Total Number Of Incidents By Year And Location

LOCATION	YEAR SEPT-DEC 1990	JAN-JUNE 1991	SEPT-DEC 1991	JAN-JUNE 1992	TOTAL # of INCIDENTS
Outside Somewhere	8 (25.0%)*	7 (21.9%)	12 (37.5%)	5 (15.6%)	32 (9.9%)
Playground	35 (24.1%)	34 (23.4%)	31 (17.9%)	50 (34.5%)	150 (46.3%)
In School	1 (6.3%)	7 (43.8%)	4 (25.0%)	4 (25.0%)	16 (4.9%)
Off School Grounds	1 (25.0%)	0	2 (50.0%)	1 (25.0%)	4 (1.2%)
Classroom	23 (28.8%)	5 (6.3%)	23 (28.8%)	29 (36.3%)	80 (24.7%)
Gym	2 (22.2%)	0	5 (55.6%)	2 (22.2%)	9 (2.8%)
Hallway	4 (30.8%)	1 (7.7%)	6 (46.2%)	2 (15.4%)	13 (4.0%)
Lunch Room	0	0	1 (50.0%)	1 (50.0%)	2 (0.6%)
Washroom	3 (16.7%)	6 (33.3%)	2 (11.1%)	7 (38.9%)	18 (5.6%)
TOTALS	77 (23.8%)	60 (18.5%)	86 (26.5%)	101 (31.2%)	324++

* Percentages based on row totals.
\+ Percentages based on column totals.
++ Location data missing for 77 students.

Table 6
Total Number Of Incidents By Location And Behavior

BEHAVIORAL CATEGORIES	LOCATION									
	PRIMARY PLAY-GROUND		OUTSIDE		PLAY-GROUND		IN SCHOOL		OFF SCHOOL GROUNDS	
RELATED TO PLAY										
dangerous to self	0		1	(12.5%)*	7	(87.5%)	0		0	
dangerous to others	3	(8.6%)	13	(37.1%)	12	(34.3%)	0		1	(2.9%)
rough play	0		0		10	(76.9%)	0		0	
play	0		0		0		0		0	
throwing objects	0		4	(19.0%)	7	(33.3%)	0		0	
PHYSICAL AGGRESSION										
fighting	0		6	(6.5%)	57	(62.0%)	7	(7.6%)	1	(1.1%)
fighting with injury	0		0		7	(87.5%)	0		0	
kicking	0		0		6	(60.0%)	1	(10.0%)	0	
bullying	0		0		4	(66.7%)	1	(16.7%)	1	(16.7%)
ACTS AGAINST PROPERTY										
school	0		0		4	(40.0%)	0		0	
student	0		0		2	(100.0%)	0		0	
stealing	0		0		0		0		0	

Table 6 (Cont.)

BEHAVIORAL CATEGORIES	LOCATION										TOTAL # of INCIDENTS	
	CLASS-ROOM		GYM		HALLWAY		LUNCH		WASHROOM			
RELATED TO PLAY												
dangerous to self	0		0		0		0		0		8	(2.4%)+
dangerous to others	5	(14.3%)	1	(2.9%)	0		0		0		35	(10.7%)
rough play	3	(23.1%)	0		0		0		0		13	(4.0%)
play	2	(25.0%)	0		0		0		6	(75.0%)	8	(2.4%)
throwing objects	8	(38.1%)	0		1	(4.8%)	0		1	(4.8%)	21	(6.4%)
PHYSICAL AGGRESSION												
fighting	14	(15.2%)	1	(1.1%)	3	(3.3%)	1	(1.1%)	2	(2.2%)	92	(28.0%)
fighting with injury	0		0		0		1	(12.5%)	0		8	(2.4%)
kicking	3	(30.0%)	0		0		0		0		10	(30.%)
bullying	0		0		0		0		0		6	(1.8%)
ACTS AGAINST PROPERTY												
school	5	(50.0%)	0		0		0		1	(10.0%)	10	(3.0%)
student	0		0		0		0		0		2	(0.6%)
stealing	2	(100.0%)	0		0		0		0		2	(0.6%)

Table 6 (Cont.)

BEHAVIORAL CATEGORIES	LOCATION									
	PRIMARY PLAY-GROUND		OUTSIDE		PLAY-GROUND		IN SCHOOL		OFF SCHOOL GROUNDS	
RULE BREAKING										
school rules	2	(10.5%)	0		10	(52.6%)	0		0	
skipping classes	0		0		2	(22.2%)	2	(22.2%)	0	
classroom rules	0		0		0		1	(6.7%)	0	
annoying others	0		1	(3.4%)	14	(48.3%)	4	(13.8%)	0	
temper tantrums	0		0		0		0		0	
VERBAL MISBEHAVIOR										
towards staff	0		0		2	(28.6%)	0		0	
towards students	0		1	(14.3%)	4	(57.1%)	0		0	
obscene language	0		1	(12.5%)	4	(50.0%)	0		0	
DEFIANCE TOWARD STAFF	2	(2.9%)	3	(4.3%)	16	(23.2%)	4	(5.8%)	0	

Table 6 (Cont.)

BEHAVIORAL CATEGORIES	LOCATION					TOTAL # of INCIDENTS
	CLASS-ROOM	GYM	HALLWAY	LUNCH	WASHROOM	
RULE BREAKING						
school rules	1 (5.3%)	0	4 (21.1%)	0	2 (10.5%)	19 (5.8%)
skipping class	1 (11.1%)	0	0	0	4 (44.4%)	9 (2.7%)
classroom rules	12 (80.0%)	2 (13.3%)	0	0	0	15 (4.6%)
annoying others	6 (20.7%)	0	3 (10.3%)	0	1 (3.4%)	29 (8.8%)
temper tantrums	1 (100.0%)	0	0	0	0	1 (0.3%)
VERBAL MISBEHAVIOR						
towards staff	3 (42.9%)	2 (28.6%)	0	0	0	7 (2.1%)
towards students	1 (14.3%)	1 (14.3%)	0	0	0	7 (2.1%)
obscene language	3 (37.5%)	0	0	0	0	8 (2.4%)
DEFIANCE TOWARD STAFF	31 (44.9%)	8 (11.6%)	4 (5.8%)	0	1 (1.4%)	69 (21.0%)

Table 6 (Cont.)

BEHAVIORAL CATEGORIES	LOCATION				
	PRIMARY PLAY-GROUND	OUTSIDE	PLAY-GROUND	IN SCHOOL	OFF SCHOOL GROUNDS
SEXUAL BEHAVIOR	0	0	3 (60.0%)	0	0
ACTIONS WITH INTENT TO INJURE					
against students	0	4 (21.1%)	11 (57.9%)	0	1 (5.3%)
hitting a teacher	0	0	0	0	0

Table 6 (Cont.)

BEHAVIORAL CATEGORIES	LOCATION					TOTAL # of INCIDENTS
	CLASS-ROOM	GYM	HALLWAY	LUNCH	WASHROOM	
SEXUAL BEHAVIOR	1 (20.0%)	0	0	0	1	5 (1.5%)
ACTIONS WITH INTENT TO INJURE						
against students	1 (5.3%)	2 (10.5%)	0	0	0	16 (5.8%)
hitting a teacher	1 (100.0%)	0	0	0	0	1 (0.3%)

* Percentages based on row totals.
\+ Percentages based on column totals.

Table 7
Total Number Of Incidents By Year And Consequence

CONSEQUENCE	YEAR SEPT-DEC 1990	JAN-JUNE 1991	SEPT-DEC 1991	JAN-JUNE 1992	TOTAL # of INCIDENTS
recess detention	5 (45.5%)	5 (45.5%)	1 (9.1%)	0	11 (2.8%)
miss one recess	20 (16.4%)	24 (19.7%)	46 (37.7%)	32 (26.2%)	122 (31.4%)
miss 2 recesses	7 (17.1%)	8 (19.5%)	7 (17.1%)	19 (46.3%)	41 (10.5%)
miss 3 recesses	3 (60.0%)	2 (40.0%)	0	0	5 (1.3%)
miss 4 recesses	1 (33.3%)	0	2 (66.7%)	0	3 (0.8%)
miss 5 recesses	1 (25.0%)	1 (25.0%)	0	2 (50.0%)	4 (1.0%)
1/4 hr. detention	0	0	2 (66.7%)	1 (33.3%)	3 (0.8%)
1/2 hr. detention	12 (52.2%)	2 (8.7%)	4 (17.4%)	5 (21.7%)	23 (5.9%)
2 detentions	1 (100.0%)	0	0	0	1 (0.3%)
parent contacted	10 (14.3%)	15 (21.4%)	24 (34.3%)	21 (30.0%)	70 (18.0%)
threatened to call parents	0	0	2 (50.0%)	2 (50.0%)	4 (1.0%)
threatened to be sent home	0	0	1 (100.0%)	0	1 (0.3%)
in-school suspension	1 (5.3%)	6 (31.6%)	9 (47.4%)	3 (15.8%)	19 (4.9%)
sent home	1 (20.0%)	0	1 (20.0%)	3 (60.0%)	5 (1.3%)
1/2 day suspension	0	4 (40.0%)	3 (30.0%)	3 (30.0%)	10 (2.6%)
1 day suspension	0	2 (66.7%)	1 (33.3%)	0	3 (0.8%)
parent took student home	2 (40.0%)	2 (40.0%)	1 (20.0%)	0	5 (1.3%)
gave apology	5 (17.2%)	0	7 (24.1%)	17 (58.6%)	29 (7.5%)

Table 7 (Cont.)

CONSEQUENCE	YEAR SEPT-DEC 1990	JAN-JUNE 1991	SEPT-DEC 1991	JAN-JUNE 1992	TOTAL # of INCIDENTS
restitution	6 (60.0%)	1 (10.0%)	2 (20.0%)	1 (10.0%)	10 (2.6%)
reprimanded	21 (29.2%)	10 (13.9%)	16 (22.2%)	25 (34.7%)	72 (18.5%)
saw principal	5 (12.8%)	4 (10.3%)	15 (38.5%)	15 (38.5%)	39 (10.0%)
clean classroom	0	0	1 (33.3%)	2 (66.7%)	3 (0.8%)
writing lines	1 (33.3%)	0	2 (66.7%)	0	3 (0.8%)
completed a behavior plan	3 (42.9%)	0	1 (14.3%)	3 (42.9%)	7 (1.8%)
sat in corner or office	2 (40.0%)	0	2 (40.0%)	1 (20.0%)	5 (1.3%)
5 minute time out	6 (75.0%)	1 (12.5%)	1 (12.5%)	0	8 (2.1%)
head down for 5 minutes	1 (100.0%)	0	0	0	1 (0.3%)
sent to time out	2 (50.0%)	0	1 (25.0%)	1 (25.0%)	4 (1.0%)
work in principal's office	1 (50.0%)	1 (50.0%)	0	0	2 (0.5%)
not allowed to participate in cross country	0	0	1 (100.0%)	0	1 (0.3%)
miss 1 gym class	2 (40.0%)	0	2 (40.0%)	1 (20.0%)	5 (1.3%)
miss 2 gym classes	0	0	1 (100.0%)	0	1 (0.3%)
miss 3 gym classes	0	0	1 (100.0%)	0	1 (0.3%)
behavior reported to superintendent	0	0	1 (50.0%)	1 (50.0%)	2 (0.5%)
letter sent to assistant superintendent	0	0	1 (100.0%)	0	1 (0.3%)

Table 7 (Cont.)

CONSEQUENCE	YEAR SEPT-DEC 1990	JAN-JUNE 1991	SEPT-DEC 1991	JAN-JUNE 1992	TOTAL # of INCIDENTS
father met with principal	1 (33.3%)	0	1 (33.3%)	1 (33.3%)	3 (0.8%)
separated them	2 (100.0%)	0	0	0	2 (0.5%)
work required	1 (100.0%)	0	0	0	1 (0.3%)
lost 2 points for House	1 (100.0%)	0	0	0	1 (0.3%)
clean up mess	2 (33.3%)	0	0	4 (66.7%)	6 (1.5%)
moved into corner of classroom	2 (100.0%)	0	0	0	2 (0.5%)
missed seeing play	1 (50.0%)	0	0	1 (50.0%)	2 (0.5%)
not allowed to go to washroom during class	0	0	0	1 (100.0%)	1 (0.3%)
referred to counselor	0	0	0	4 (100.0%)	4 (1.0%)
suspended from lunch prog.	0	0	0	2 (100.0%)	2 (0.5%)
withdrawn from Band Concert	0	0	0	2 (100.0%)	2 (0.5%)
suspended from patrols for 3 days	0	0	0	3 (100.0%)	3 (0.8%)
TOTALS	92 (22.9%)	71 (17.7%)	108 (26.9%)	130 (32.4%)	389

* Percentages based on row totals.
\+ Percentages based on column totals.
++ Data missing for 12 students.

Table 8
Total Number Of Incidents By Year And House

HOUSE	YEAR SEPT-DEC 1990	JAN-JUNE 1991	SEPT-DEC 1991	JAN-JUNE 1992	TOTAL # of INCIDENTS
YELLOW	19 (16.2%)*	18 (15.4%)	37 (31.6%)	43 (36.8%)	117 (29.3%)+
PURPLE	17 (18.3%)	14 (15.1%)	24 (25.8%)	38 (40.9%)	93 (23.3%)
RED	27 (36.5%)	18 (24.3%)	12 (24.3%)	17 (23.0%)	74 (18.5%)
BLUE	29 (25.0%)	21 (18.1%)	35 (30.2%)	31 (26.7%)	116 (29.0%)
TOTALS	92 (23.0%)	71 (17.8%)	108 (27.0%)	129 (32.3%)	400++

* Percentages based on row totals.
\+ Percentages based on column totals.
++ House data missing for 1 student.

APPENDIX B

Pre-Program Staff Survey Results

Primo Elementary School

Pre-Program Teacher Survey Results

Circle the most appropriate response.

I. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1. How long have you worked at Primo School?

3 (17.6%)	less than 1 year.
7 (41.2%)	1-3 years.
3 (17.6%)	4-6 years.
2 (11.8%)	6-10 years.
2 (11.8%)	more than 10 years.

2. What is your primary responsibility within Primo School?

4 (23.5%)	Primary (K-3) teacher.
1 (5.9%)	Primary (K-3) teacher's aid.
3 (17.6%)	Elementary (4-6) teacher.
0 (0.0%)	Elementary (4-6) teacher's aid.
4 (23.5%)	Support staff (e.g., resource, administration, counsellor)
3 (17.6%)	Special subject area staff (e.g., music, physical ed., art, etc.)
2 (11.8%)	other, please specify

3. How long have you been working in the educational profession?

0 (0.0%)	less than 1 year.
2 (11.8%)	1-3 years.
5 (29.4%)	4-6 years.
1 (5.9%)	6-10 years.
9 (52.9%)	more than 10 years.

II. SCHOOL BEHAVIOR

4. I think **Primo School** has

0 (0.0%)	significantly fewer student behavior problems than similar schools.
6 (35.3%)	fewer student behavior problems than similar schools.
8 (47.1%)	more student behavior problems than similar schools.
1 (5.9%)	significantly more student behavior problems than similar schools.
2 (11.8%)	did not respond to the question.

5. There are 181 students attending **Primo School**, what percent of these students do you think contribute to the behavior problems at the school? **mean = 17.06%**

6.i. What percent of the students that contribute to behavior problems **at the school** do you think are boys? **mean = 67.12%**

6.ii. What percent of the students that contribute to behavior problems **at the school** do you think are girls? **mean = 10.29%**

7. If there is there is more than a 20% difference between the percentages reported in 6.i. and 6.ii., explain what you think causes this difference.

8. What percent of all behavior problems in **Primo School** do each of the following behaviors represent? [Note: Total should not exceed 100%.]

mean = 16.82% physical aggression [i.e., actions intended to hurt] toward students.
mean = 16.41% aggressive play [i.e., actions not intended to hurt] with students.
mean = 1.82% physical aggression toward school staff.
mean = 9.76% careless actions.
mean = 16.17% aggressive communication [i.e., threatening or abusive language] toward students.
mean = 2.65% aggressive communication [i.e., threatening or abusive language] toward staff.
mean = 8.77% refusing to follow directions given by a staff member.
mean = 7.53% refusing to follow school rules.
mean = 5.94% refusing to follow classroom rules.
mean = 2.24% destruction of school property.
mean = 2.77% destruction of student property.
mean = 1.18% destruction of staff property.
mean = 1.82% stealing school property.
mean = 3.00% stealing student property.
mean = 1.00% stealing staff property.

9. On the line to the left of each **area** listed below, indicate the percent of the behavior problems that occur in that location. [Note: Total should not exceed 100%.]

mean = 36.71% on the playground during recess.
mean = 20.00% on the playground during lunch.
mean = 3.52% on the playground at times other than lunch or recess.
mean = 12.53% in classrooms
mean = 2.29% in the gym during physical education
mean = 3.53% in the washrooms.
mean = 3.77% in the hallways.
mean = 3.47% during assemblies, concerts, etc.
mean = 3.94% on the way to and from school.
mean = 0.0% other, specify.

10. **Primo School** has a set of rules/procedures that govern student behavior.

16 (94.1%) Yes.
1 (5.9%) No. **[IF NO, SKIP TO QUESTION 16.]**

11. If there is a set of **school** rules/procedures, are all students aware of them?

10 (58.8%) Yes.
6 (35.3%) No.
1 (5.9%) did not respond to question.

12. If there is a set of **school** rules/procedures, have these been discussed with your students?

14 (82.4%) Yes.
2 (11.8%) No.
1 (5.9%) did not respond to question.

13. If there is a set of **school** rules/procedures, are the consequences for not following these rules stated?

11 (64.7%) Yes.
5 (29.4%) No.
1 (5.9%) did not respond to question.

14. If there are stated consequences, are **all students** aware of them?

5 (29.4%) Yes.
8 (47.1%) No.
4 (23.5%) did not respond to question.

15. If there are stated consequences, have these been discussed with **your students**?

10 (58.8%)	Yes.
3 (17.6%)	No.
4 (23.5%)	did not respond to question.

16. Overall, how effective do you think existing **school** discipline rules/procedures are?

3 (17.6%)	effective.
10 (58.8%)	somewhat effective.
1 (5.9%)	somewhat ineffective.
3 (17.6%)	ineffective.

17. How effective do you think **school support services/administration** are in dealing with school wide behavior problems?

4 (23.5%)	effective.
6 (35.3%)	somewhat effective.
5 (29.4%)	somewhat ineffective.
2 (11.8%)	ineffective.

Explain your response.

III. CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR

18. I think the **classroom(s)** I work in has/have

4 (23.5%)	significantly fewer student behavior problems than similar classrooms.
6 (35.3%)	fewer student behavior problems than similar classrooms.
2 (11.8%)	more student behavior problems than similar classrooms.
3 (17.6%)	significantly more student behavior problems than similar classrooms.
2 (11.8%)	did not respond to question.

19. What percent of the students in the **classroom(s)** you work in contribute to the behavior problems in that/those **classroom(s)**? **mean = 23.24%**

20. The students in the **classroom(s)** I work in are

0 (0.0%)	never involved in problems outside the classroom(s).
2 (11.8%)	seldom involved in problems outside the classroom(s).
6 (35.3%)	sometimes involved in problems outside the classroom(s).
6 (35.3%)	often involved in problems outside the classroom(s).
3 (17.6%)	did not respond to question.

21. Listed below are a number of common behavior problems. On the line to the left of each problem, indicate the percent of all behavior problems that it represents in the **classroom(s)** in which you work. [Note: Total should not exceed 100%.]

mean = 9.12%	physical aggression [i.e., actions intended to hurt] toward students.
mean = 14.77%	aggressive play [i.e., actions not intended to hurt] with students.
mean = 0.94%	physical aggression toward school staff.
mean = 7.18%	careless actions.
mean = 8.65%	aggressive communication [i.e., threatening or abusive language] toward students.
mean = 3.06%	aggressive communication [i.e., threatening or abusive language] toward staff.
mean = 5.88%	refusal to follow directions give by a staff member.
mean = 6.00%	refusal to follow school rules.
mean = 11.94%	refusal to follow classroom rules.
mean = 2.71%	destruction of school property.
mean = 1.77%	destruction of student property.
mean = 0.35%	destruction of staff property.
mean = 0.94%	stealing school property.
mean = 1.71%	stealing student property.
mean = 0.35%	stealing staff property.

22. The **classroom(s)** in which I work has/have a set of rules/procedures that govern student behavior.

15 (88.2%)	Yes.
0 (0.0%)	No. **[SKIP TO QUESTION 29.]**
0 (0.0%)	I do not know. **[SKIP TO QUESTION 29.]**
2 (11.8%)	did not respond to question.

23. If you **answered yes** to question 22, are all students aware of the rules?

14 (82.4%)	Yes.
0 (0.0%)	No.
1 (5.9%)	I do not know.
2 (11.8%)	did not respond to question.

24. If you **answered yes** to question 22, have the rules been discussed with the students?

15 (88.2%)	Yes.
0 (0.0%)	No.
0 (0.0%)	I do not know.
2 (11.8%)	did not respond to question.

25. If you **answered yes** to question 22, are there consequences established for not following the rules?

14 (82.4%)	Yes.
1 (5.9%)	No.
0 (0.0%)	I do not know.
2 (11.8%)	did not respond to question.

26. If you **answered yes** to question 25, are **all students** aware of the consequences?

12 (70.6%)	Yes.
0 (0.0%)	No.
2 (11.8%)	I do not know.
3 (17.6%)	did not respond to question.

27. If you **answered yes** to question 25, have the consequences been discussed with the **students**?

13 (76.5%)	Yes.
0 (0.0%)	No.
0 (0.0%)	I do not know.
4 (23.5%)	did not respond to question.

28. How effective do you think the **classroom** discipline rules/procedures are in the classroom(s) in which you work ?

6 (35.3%)	effective.
7 (41.2%)	somewhat effective.
2 (11.8%)	somewhat ineffective.
0 (0.0%)	ineffective.
0 (0.0%)	I do not know.
2 (11.8%)	did not respond to question.

29. Overall, how effective do you think you are with dealing with **classroom** discipline problems?

7 (41.2%)	effective.
9 (52.9%)	somewhat effective.
0 (0.0%)	somewhat ineffective.
0 (0.0%)	ineffective.
0 (0.0%)	I do not know.
1 (5.9%)	did not respond to question.

30. How effective do you think **school support services/administration** are in helping you deal with behavior problems in your classroom?

5 (29.4%)	effective.
7 (41.2%)	somewhat effective.
0 (0.0%)	somewhat ineffective.
3 (17.6%)	ineffective.
1 (5.9%)	I do not know.
1 (5.9%)	did not respond to question.

Explain you response.

31. As a group, rate the students in the **classroom(s) you work in** on the following attitudes and competencies by placing the appropriate number in the space to the left of each item. Use the following rating scale.

1 = a high level of competence or positive attitude.
2 = a moderate level of competence or positive attitude.
3 = an average level of competence or positive attitude.
4 = a slightly less than average level of competence or positive attitude.
5 = a low level of competence or positive attitude.

	1 high	2 moderate	3 average	4 slightly less	5 low	did not answer
empathy.	0	5 (29.4%)	6 (35.3%)	2 (11.8%)	2 (11.8%)	2 (11.8%)
social competence.	0	5 (29.4%)	4 (23.5%)	5 (29.4%)	1 (5.9%)	2 (11.8%)
interpersonal problem solving skills.	0	3 (17.6%)	5 (29.4%)	3 (17.6%)	4 (23.5%)	2 (11.8%)
anger management.	0	3 (17.6%)	5 (29.4%)	5 (29.4%)	2 (11.8%)	2 (11.8%)
controlling impulsive behavior.	1 (5.9%)	3 (17.6%)	4 (23.5%)	4 (23.5%)	3 (17.6%)	2 (11.8%)

32. For the past year and a half, Primo School used a card system to report all incidents of student misbehavior. Below, note the **effect(s)** this system had on (a) reducing the amount of misbehavior, (b) your ability to deal with behavior problems, and (c) the students' understanding and ability to cope with their behavior.

(a)

(b)

(c)

33. How do you think the **students felt** about the card system?

34. Below, record any additional comments you would like to make about student behavior in the school, classroom and/or on the playground?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME!

QUESTION 7

If there is there is more than a 20% difference between the percentages reported in 6.i. and 6.ii., explain what you think causes this difference.

Number of Respondents	
7	I believe boys are basically brought up to be more aggressive than girls.
2	More single mothers/low SES situations.
2	I think boys fight more physically and girls verbally.
1	Children see males on TV in more aggressive roles.
1	Boys are more independent in terms of behavior - not so easily led or controlled by group dynamics.
1	Male role models in community are rough, non-educated male dominated.
1	Boys less mature, less mannerly and less conformists.
1	The group influence.
1	I do not know.
1	Boys hit - girls cry.

QUESTION 17

How effective do you think school support services/administration are in dealing with school wide behavior problems? Explain your response.

Number of Respondents	
3	I am supported when I ask for it.
1	The support committee helps teachers deal with sever discipline problems.
1	I do not see discipline within this school as a problem.
1	I deal with behavior problems myself.
1	Invisibility of principal.
1	Principal seldom attends assemblies.
1	Principal does not know what happens in individual classrooms/hallways unless teacher sends a student to office.
1	Problems are being discussed by staff and solutions are given.
1	Administration and support services can only do so much - the problem can't be dumped on them.
1	Usually it is still up to classroom teacher to administer discipline.
1	Some students do not have enough respect for authority, so going to see principal does not bother them.
1	The most often used response is to expel which does not work as a solution, it only postpones the problem.
1	Problems can be avoided by anticipation. Being in the halls, outside, at the doors, in the washroom. Proper prevention measures could easily solve 75% of all our problems.
1	Our administrator does not know our students.
1	Principal has a limited sense of children and as a result his patience/expertise is limited.
1	Students see principal with students very rarely so they don't recognize him as an authority or friend or support. Neither do the parents.
1	I don't think they treat reasons for the underlying behavior.
1	Punishment, I feel, is ineffective to use for acting out behavior.

QUESTION 17 (Cont.)

Number of Respondents	
1	Consequences on a hit and miss basis.
1	Staff has <u>not</u> developed appropriate school wide rules and consequences.
1	The school handbook has never been a priority with parents/staff/administration or updated.
1	More consistent involvement in all school activities.
1	Problems with student behavior are attended to promptly with feedback and involvement of staff!
1	In most cases, the discipline works for the time being, but often it does not discourage the repeat offender.

QUESTION 30

How effective do you think <u>school support services/administration</u> are in helping you deal with behavior problems in your classroom? Explain you response.

Number of Respondents	
3	I can get help from colleagues and support staff.
2	Haven't been let down yet.
1	Seldom send students to office - I'm capable of handling my own discipline.
1	I can't count on support so I generally handle it myself.
1	The one student I have is not handled by administration because it frustrates him, therefore it is left to me. Although, knowing I am solely responsible makes it easy to make decisions.
1	Not really applicable.

QUESTION 32 (a)

For the past year and a half, Primo School used a card system to report all incidents of student misbehavior. Below, note the effect(s) this system had on (a) reducing the amount of misbehavior.

Number of Respondents	
3	Haven't had to fill out a card, therefore not able to comment on how effective the system is.
2	Unsure.
2	0%, kids do not seem to care about the cards - good for statistical purposes only.
1	Students more aware of their behavior.
1	There is a record classroom teacher can file and use when talking to parents.
1	Points can be deducted from House Score.
1	For my classroom it seems to make little difference.
1	At first it did reduce misbehavior because it meant losing house points. But the reduction hasn't continued.
1	Has been effective especially for the non-repeaters or mild problem students.
1	Extreme cases tend to be immune after 5-10 cards.
1	Card system not effective on primary end because they do not think ahead to the consequences. They act on impulse.
1	90% of all problems are not written up by the teacher, but rather the principal.
1	I do not believe any misbehavior was eliminated - kids who misbehave will do impulsive behaviors irregardless.
1	I do not know.
1	Seems to have reduced the amount in most children.
1	Card system has somewhat reduced the amount of misbehavior.

QUESTION 32 (b)

For the past year and a half, Primo School used a card system to report all incidents of student misbehavior. Below, note the <u>effect(s)</u> this system had on (b) your ability to deal with behavior problems.

Number of Respondents	
4	Good way of tracking the behaviors.
2	Good for documentation only.
2	Have not used the system.
1	Flag the student of most concern.
1	I feel I can deal with the student behavior effectively.
1	Having a definite set of rules and consequences enables students to learn a behavior code and reinforces class and school rules.
1	Most days I can be objective and uninvolved emotionally.
1	Most behaviors stop when I deal with them, therefore I seldom write a card.
1	I didn't have to deal with the major problems. I could write out card and administration dealt with it. I could continue with my other students.
1	Makes administration aware of problems I am having to deal with.
1	For some, threat of a blue card will work.
1	I find I do most of the talking and resolving as administration does not have time.
1	I try to use alternatives to aggression by discussing other ways to handle the students.
1	Makes no difference to me - used cards only as a record - I believe in documentation.
1	Parents can be updated by using cards.
1	Easier to deal with behavior problems because a documented set of rules dealing with misbehavior can be referred to.

QUESTION 32 (c)

For the past year and a half, Primo School used a card system to report all incidents of student misbehavior. Below, note the <u>effect(s)</u> this system had on (c) the students' understanding and ability to cope with their behavior.

Number of Respondents	
5	Students more aware of their behavior.
3	can review student behavior at any time.
2	Have not use the system.
2	My kids have much stricter consequences than the cards, so it doesn't seem to help a lot.
1	Students must understand the rules and learn how to function within school and classroom and consequences if they break them.
1	Our school has a lot of behavior problems in grades 4 and 5. The same student difficult all through school - have gotten progressively worse.
1	Some students have a lot of difficulty coping with their anger, especially as they get older.
1	See their peers acting this way and follow the same pattern.
1	Helps communication with the home.
1	Students are beginning to be more accepting of each other's differences.
1	Students have more empathy then before.
1	0%.
1	Younger kids have difficulty with the concept.
1	Does not impact with students' coping and understanding.
1	Positive effect - the cards keep track of students' behavior.
1	Can be used to help students see their pattern of behavior and help them develop more effective strategies to deal with their behavior.

QUESTION 33

How do you think the students felt about the card system?

Number of Respondents	
4	I feel they think it is a fair system.
2	Unsure.
2	I do not know.
1	Have not used the system.
1	The good students worry about getting a card.
1	Some students proud of the number of cards they get. - Negative reinforcement - like notches in their belts.
1	Positive.
1	Good - especially with well behaved students. The worse students may say they do not care, but it is best procedure for them also.
1	I don't think younger kids think about card system until it happens.
1	What is good, is that students have to take responsibility for their own actions.
1	Could not care less for 99% of those who get them.
1	First year - had some impact for some students.
1	Most aggressive disruptive students don't care.
1	Possibly somewhat threatened.

QUESTION 34

Below, record any additional comments you would like to make about student behavior in the school, classroom and/or on the playground?

Number of Respondents	
1	Concerned about amount of violence in student play.
1	Concerned about verbal abuse on playground, if not addressed it becomes the norm.
1	Parents must be counselled regarding school rules and expectations.
1	It doesn't help the teacher if parents tells child to respond to aggression with aggression.
1	I have a low enrollment and have few incidents of misbehavior because of this. Had many more problems when I had higher enrollments of 27 and 30.
1	My students are on such a consequence based program that this survey was indeed difficult for me to do.
1	We need consistent consequences and follow through by all staff. I don't think this program will work unless all teachers/staff show a visible consistent pattern.
1	Classroom behavior problems in this school could often be related to (1) academic frustration (2) clash of educational values between home and school.
1	I am surprised at the copying of bad behavior that goes on.
1	Students who break rules seem to be admired.
1	Students have become more aggressive in this area over the years because of many reasons. Now 40% of my class is single parent - family support systems have failed.
1	The problem in our school is not with the kids but rather the teachers and administration.
1	The teachers should be waiting at doors, walking with classes to and from places and be visible to all students.
1	The principal is not doing his share of the patrolling the areas where behavior problems occur - why should the teachers??
1	I believe that some children need to have good behaviors and how to deal with poor behaviors written onto their "blank slate". Teachers are more and more responsible for this, it seems.

QUESTION 34 (Cont.)

Number of Respondents	
1	I think the reason for some bad behaviors in the classroom is boredom.
1	I think the reason for some bad behaviors in the classroom is low self-esteem.
1	Most students respond to firm consistent discipline. A few seem to get away with more and may cause others to wander.
1	Generally, I find the school to be a calm and peaceful place to work.
1	I find general student behavior varies from class to class with some classes being "near perfect" and some a "nightmare".
1	I think most of problems I encounter in the classroom and on the playground stem from a large lack of social skills, general rudeness and negative attitudes (not necessarily aggressive, just ignorant).

APPENDIX C

Post-Program Staff Survey Results

Primo Elementary School

Post-Program Teacher Survey

Circle the most appropriate response.

I. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1. How long have you worked at Primo School?

0 (0.0%)	less than 1 year.
8 (80.0%)	1-3 years.
5 (31.3%)	4-6 years.
1 (6.3%)	6-10 years.
2 (12.5%)	more than 10 years.

2. What is your primary responsibility within Primo School?

4 (25.0%)	Primary (K-3) teacher.
1 (6.3%)	Primary (K-3) teacher's aid.
3 (18.8%)	Elementary (4-6) teacher.
0 (0.0%)	Elementary (4-6) teacher's aid.
4 (25.0%)	Support staff (e.g., resource, administration, counsellor)
3 (18.8%)	Special subject area staff (e.g., music, physical ed., art, etc.)
1 (6.3%)	other, please specify _____.

3. How long have you been working in the educational profession?

0 (0.0%)	less than 1 year.
1 (6.3%)	1-3 years.
6 (37.5%)	4-6 years.
0 (0.0%)	7-10 years.
9 (56.3%)	more than 10 years.

II. SCHOOL BEHAVIOR

4.i. Since the introduction of the Second Step Program, **Primo School** has had

0 (0.0%)	significantly fewer student behavior problems.
8 (50.0%)	fewer student behavior problems.
0 (0.0%)	more student behavior problems.
0 (0.0%)	significantly more student behavior problems.
6 (37.5%)	no change in the number of student behavior problems.
2 (12.5%)	Did not answer the question.

4.ii. If a change was noted above, was the change the result of the Second Step Program?

2 (12.5%)	yes
3 (18.8%)	no
11 (68.8%)	Did not answer the question.

5. The Second Step Program was:

2 (12.5%)	more effective for boys.
2 (12.5%)	more effective for girls.
6 (37.5%)	equally effective for both groups.
6 (37.5%)	Did not answer the question.

6. Since the introduction of the Second Step Program in **Primo School**, has the incidence of each of the behaviors listed below "increased", "decreased", or "stayed the same". Indicate your opinion by circling 1, 2, or 3. If you circled "decreased" or "increased" for a behavior, indicate whether or not you think the Second Step Program caused the change by circling either "yes" or "no".

		decreased	stayed the same	increased	caused by Second Step	
					Yes	No
a.	physical aggression [i.e., actions intended to hurt] toward students	7 (43.8%)	7 (43.8%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (25.0%)	3 (18.8%)
b.	aggressive play [i.e., actions not intended to hurt] with students	6 (37.5%)	8 (50.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (18.8%)	1 (6.3%)
c.	physical aggression toward school staff	0 (0.0%)	11 (68.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (18.8%)
d.	careless actions	3 (18.8%)	10 (62.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (18.8%)
e.	aggressive communication [i.e., threatening or abusive language] toward students	3 (18.8%)	7 (43.8%)	2 (12.5%)	2 (12.5%)	3 (18.8%)
f.	aggressive communication [i.e., threatening or abusive language] toward staff	2 (12.5%)	9 (56.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (6.3%)	4 (25.0%)
g.	refusing to follow directions given by a staff member	1 (6.3%)	9 (56.3%)	2 (12.5%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (25.0%)
h.	refusing to follow school rules	3 (18.8%)	8 (50.0%)	2 (12.5%)	1 (6.3%)	5 (31.3%)
i.	refusing to follow classroom rules	2 (12.5%)	9 (56.3%)	2 (12.5%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (31.3%)
j.	destruction of school property	4 (25.0%)	8 (50.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (25.0%)
k.	destruction of student property	1 (6.3%)	10 (62.5%)	1 (6.3%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (18.8%)
l.	destruction of staff property	2 (12.5%)	9 (56.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (25.0%)
m.	stealing school property	9 (56.3%)	2 (12.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (25.0%)
n.	stealing student property	0 (0.0%)	11 (68.8%)	1 (6.3%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (25.0%)
o.	stealing staff property	0 (0.0%)	10 (62.5%)	1 (6.3%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (18.8%)

7. Have the rules that govern student behavior at **Primo School** changed as a result of the Second Step Program?

5 (31.3%) Yes.
9 (56.3%) No. **[IF NO, SKIP TO QUESTION 11.]**
2 (12.5%) Did not answer this question.

8. Are all students aware of this change?

3 (18.8%) Yes.
1 (6.3%) No.
12 (75.0%) Did not answer this question.

9. Have discussed these changes with your students?

2 (12.5%) Yes.
1 (6.3%) No.
13 (81.3%) Did not answer this question.

10. Overall, how effective do you think these new rules are?

0 (0.0%) effective.
5 (31.3%) somewhat effective.
0 (0.0%) somewhat ineffective.
0 (0.0%) ineffective.
11 (68.8%) Did not answer this question.

III. CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR

11.i. Since the introduction of the Second Step Program, **the classroom(s) I work in** has had:

0 (0.0%) significantly fewer student behavior problems.
4 (25.0%) fewer student behavior problems.
3 (18.8%) more student behavior problems.
0 (0.0%) significantly more student behavior problems.
6 (37.5%) no change in the number of student behavior problems.
3 (18.8%) Did not answer this question.

11.ii. If a change was noted above, was the change the result of the Second Step Program?

1 (6.3%) yes
5 (31.3%) no
10 (62.5%) Did not answer this question.

12. What percentage of the students in the **classroom(s)** you work in contribute to the behavior problems in that/those **classroom(s)**?

mean response = 21.7%

5 (31.3%) Did not answer this question.

13.i. Since the introduction of the Second Step Program, the students in the **classroom(s)** I work in are:

1 (6.3%)	less involved in problem behaviors outside the classroom(s).
1 (6.3%)	more involved in problem behaviors outside the classroom(s).
11 (68.8%)	involved in problems outside the classroom(s) to the same extent as before the Program.
3 (18.8%)	Did not answer this question.

13.ii. If a change was noted above, was the change the result of the Second Step Program?

1 (6.3%)	yes
4 (25.0%)	no
11 (68.8%)	Did not answer this question.

14. Since the introduction of the Second Step Program in **the classroom(s) you work in**, has the incidence of each of the behaviors listed below "increased", "decreased", or "stayed the same". Indicate your opinion by circling 1, 2, or 3. If you circled "decreased" or "increased" for a behavior, indicate whether or not you think the Second Step Program caused the change by circling either "yes" or "no".

		decreased	stayed the same	increased	caused by Second Step	
					Yes	No
a.	physical aggression [i.e., actions intended to hurt] toward students	3 (18.8%)	5 (31.3%)	1 (6.3%)	3 (18.8%)	2 (12.5%)
b.	aggressive play [i.e., actions not intended to hurt] with students	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (6.3%)	1 (6.3%)	2 (12.5%)
c.	physical aggression toward school staff	1 (6.3%)	7 (43.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (18.8%)
d.	careless actions	0 (0.0%)	8 (50.0%)	1 (6.3%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (18.8%)
e.	aggressive communication [i.e., threatening or abusive language] toward students	1 (6.3%)	5 (31.3%)	2 (12.5%)	1 (6.3%)	4 (25.0%)
f.	aggressive communication [i.e., threatening or abusive language] toward staff	2 (12.5%)	5 (31.3%)	1 (6.3%)	1 (6.3%)	4 (25.0%)
g.	refusing to follow directions given by a staff member	0 (0.0%)	7 (43.8%)	1 (6.3%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (18.8%)
h.	refusing to follow school rules	1 (6.3%)	6 (37.5%)	1 (6.3%)	1 (6.3%)	3 (18.8%)
i.	refusing to follow classroom rules	0 (0.0%)	6 (37.5%)	2 (12.5%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (25.0%)
j.	destruction of school property	0 (0.0%)	8 (50.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (18.8%)
k.	destruction of student property	0 (0.0%)	7 (43.8%)	1 (6.3%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (25.0%)
l.	destruction of staff property	1 (6.3%)	7 (43.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (18.8%)

		decreased	stayed the same	increased	caused by Second Step	
					Yes	No
m.	stealing school property	1 (6.3%)	6 (37.5%)	1 (6.3%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (18.8%)
n.	stealing student property	0 (0.0%)	6 (37.5%)	2 (12.5%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (25.0%)
o.	stealing staff property	2 (12.5%)	6 (37.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (25.0%)

15. Have the rules that govern student behavior in **the classroom(s) you work in** changed as a result of the Second Step Program?

6 (37.5%) Yes.
6 (37.5%) No. **[IF NO, SKIP TO QUESTION 18.]**
4 (25.0%) Did not answer this question.

16. Have discussed these changes with your students?

5 (31.3%) Yes.
0 (0.0%) No.
11 (68.8%) Did not answer this question.

17. Overall, how effective do you think these new rules are?

1 (6.3%) effective.
4 (25.0%) somewhat effective.
0 (0.0%) somewhat ineffective.
0 (0.0%) ineffective.
11 (68.8%) Did not answer this question.

18. Since the introduction of the Second Step Program:

7 (43.8%) I have become more effective in dealing with **classroom** discipline problems.
0 (0.0%) I have become less effective in dealing with **classroom** discipline problems.
6 (37.5%) my effectiveness in dealing with **classroom** discipline problems has not changed.
3 (18.8%) Did not answer this question.

19. Indicate the level of competence the students in the **classroom(s) you work in** have developed as a result of the Second Step Program. For each of the skills listed below place the appropriate number in the space to the left. Use the following rating scale.

1 = a high level of competence and positive attitude.
2 = a moderate level of competence and positive attitude.
3 = an average level of competence and positive attitude.
4 = a slightly less than average level of competence and positive attitude.
5 = a low level of competence and positive attitude.

	1 high	2 moderate	3 average	4 slightly less	5 low	did not answer
empathy.	0 (0.0%)	3 (18.8%)	3 (18.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	10 (62.5%)
social competence.	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (25.0%)	2 (12.5%)	0 (0.0%)	10 (62.5%)
interpersonal problem solving skills.	0 (0.0%)	2 (12.5%)	4 (25.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (6.3%)	9 (56.3%)
anger management.	0 (0.0%)	2 (12.5%)	4 (25.0%)	2 (12.5%)	0 (0.0%)	8 (50.0%)
controlling impulsive behavior.	0 (0.0%)	2 (12.5%)	2 (12.5%)	3 (18.8%)	1 (6.3%)	8 (50.0%)

20. As a result of my participation in the Second Step Program, I have learned the following new classroom management skills:

21.i. Would you recommend the Second Step Program to other schools?

10 (62.5%) Yes.
1 (6.3%) No.
5 (31.3%) Did not answer this question.

21.ii. Provide the rationale for your recommendation.

22.i. Should the Second Step Program be continued at Primo School?

12 (75.0%)	Yes.
1 (6.3%)	No.
3 (18.8%)	Did not answer this question.

22.ii. Provide the rationale for your recommendation.

23. Below, record any additional comments you would like to make about student behavior and/or the Second Step Program.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME!

QUESTION 20

As a result of my participation in the Second Step Program, I have learned the following new classroom management skills

Number of Respondents	
2	Conflict management.
1	Having the student try to resolve the conflict themselves.
1	I don't become involved in conflicts as quickly.
1	No classroom to work with.
1	Have not really participated.
1	I found it convenient at times to remind children about certain behaviors by referring to the Second Step picture cards.
1	The need to write on the students blank slates as to the type of behavior expected of them.
1	Having children practice the skills they learn. Just telling them is <u>not</u> enough.
1	Allowing students to display their <u>anger</u>, <u>but</u> consistently encouraging them to manage it using the steps suggested.
1	Consistently encouraging students to treat each other with kindness.
1	I encourage and help mediate children in solving their disputes between themselves.

QUESTION 21.ii

Provide the rationale for your recommendation.

Number of Respondents	
2	Lots of good strategies re controlling/changing behavior - all in one package.
1	I do not feel there was a significant change during the year as a result of Second Step.
1	It appeared to take a lot of time with few noticeable results.
1	I think it is important to give our students skills which will help them in a social environment.
1	I feel it is more worthwhile to take a preventative approach and reduce the misbehaviors before they can occur.
1	Reinforcement of some ideas ad techniques I already used.
1	Good for me to remember and apply when working with coworkers.
1	Can't evaluate.
1	It works well with kids that are occasionally violent. The ringleaders seem immune to it. The "good" kids get even better.
1	Second Step would work well in inner-city type schools, esp. racially mixed ones.
1	Any program that will help children deal with their feelings will increase their confidence and self-esteem would be worthwhile.
1	It is very time consuming.
1	The strategies used for learning to calm oneself down and begin to think of solutions.
1	I think these strategies will take time to learn to the extent that they can be used automatically. Maybe we will see results by grades 5 or 6.
1	Second Step allows for a time to concentrate/focus on these topics we otherwise just try to "slip in" when the occasion rises.
1	It provides a vocabulary for students. It provides a "way" to talk about it.
1	It takes the teacher off the hook a bit because you get the kids to try solving problems on their own.
1	I feel that any program that encourages children to settle disputes in a peaceful matter would be a bonus for any school.

QUESTION 22.ii

Provide the rationale for your recommendation.

Number of Respondents	
5	Second Step needs a bit more time.
3	I would like to see the outcome after it has had a few years to work.
2	They are beginning to understand the process. Now they need PRACTICE.
1	I do not feel there was a significant change during the year as a result of Second Step.
1	It appeared to take a lot of time with few noticeable results.
1	I hope P.E. will serve as the divisional model and other schools will pick up on the program.
1	Reinforcement of ideas/strategies that children focused on this year.
1	Can't judge.
1	It does not work overnight, but its effects are long-lasting once they are in place.
1	There are so many extra programs coming into classrooms that the curriculum is core subjects has to be sacrificed. It's probably a good program but it takes up time where there isn't any.
1	For a full year, not done in 4 months.

QUESTION 23

Below, record any additional comments you would like to make about student behavior and/or the Second Step Program.

Number of Respondents	
2	Again, need more time for students to internalize these solutions and incorporate into their daily lives.
1	A follow-up study 2 or 3 years down the road would be a good idea.
1	It is great when a student says "I've tried 3 different solutions and the last one worked".
1	It would have been interesting to have developed some statistics prior to this program and use them now to help evaluate.
1	Overall - the bad kids stayed the same and the good kids got better.
1	The role of the teacher in the classroom is extremely vital.
1	A valuable program but not as effective as it could have be this year because the "pressure" felt "to do" the lesions - not enough time to practice, to reflect, to incorporate lessons into daily routines.
1	It is good to have a step by step strategy for learning to problem solve and deal with their own problems as far as is possible.
1	I enjoyed the Program!
1	I didn't feel this program fit the class I had very well.

APPENDIX D

Sample *Second Step* Lesson Checklists

Dear Primo Staff Member,

We were asked to assist in the evaluation of the Second Step program that is being piloted at your school. As part of that evaluation, an implementation assessment will be carried out. The Task Checklist is to be filled out as you complete each task on it. Place the date(s) on which the task was done or was started and completed. For some tasks, you will be asked to provide you impression(s) or evaluation of certain of their features. The purpose of the Task Checklist is to identify the tasks carried out in each of the classrooms, and to obtain teacher impressions and evaluations of tasks and task materials. The information from this 'Checklist' will be used to assist in determining the relationship between program implementation and program outcomes.

For evaluation purposes individual grade levels need to be identified, however, when reporting this information will not be revealed! Only the combined results of the entire staff will be reported. These reports will be presented to the staff, principal and Division administration.

On May 30, 1992, return the completed 'Checklist' to the researchers using the attached envelop. If you have any questions regarding the survey, please feel free to contact either Paul Madak (555-1234) or Gerry Bravi (555-4321).

Thank you for taking the time to complete the Task Checklist!

Sincerely,

Paul Madak

Gerry Bravi

Second Step
Kindergarten
Task Checklist
Unit I: Empathy Training

Lesson 1: What is *Second Step*?

A. i. I conducted this unit in my class. Yes _____ No _____

ii. If yes, date started _____, date completed _____.

iii. In total, I spent approximately _____ minutes teaching this lesson.

B. i. Were the lesson and accompanying materials appropriate for your students' levels of development?

Yes_____ No_____

ii. If no, did you modify the instruction to match their levels of development?

Yes_____ No_____

C. i. Did the lesson accomplish the stated goal(s)?

Yes_____ No_____

ii. If no, did you modify the instruction to more adequately accomplish the lesson goal(s)?

Yes_____ No_____

D. i. Did the materials for this lesson adequately prepare you to deliver the lesson?

Yes_____ No_____

E. i. Was there a logical sequence to the lesson?

Yes_____ No_____

ii. If no, did you modify the sequence to meet your students' needs?

Yes_____ No_____

F. i. Did the lesson allot an adequate amount of time for the lesson?
Yes_____ No_____

ii. If no, did you modify the amount of time to better meet your students' needs?
Yes_____ No_____

G. i. Did the lesson provide adequate time for the students to practice the skill(s) being taught?
Yes_____ No_____

ii. If no, did you modify the instruction to increase the time for practice?
Yes_____ No_____

H. i. Did the lesson keep the students actively involved?
Yes_____ No_____

ii. If no, did you modify the instruction to increase student involvement?
Yes_____ No_____

I. i. Did the lesson and the accompanying materials motivate your students?
Yes_____ No_____

ii. If no, did you modify the instruction to increase motivation?
Yes_____ No_____

J. i. Did the materials for this lesson allow you to evaluate and make judgments about student performance?
Yes_____ No_____

ii. If no, did you modify the evaluation procedures to get this information?
Yes_____ No_____

K. i. Did the lesson adequately inform students of their performance and progress?
Yes_____ No_____

ii. If no, did you modify the procedures for providing student feedback?
Yes_____ No_____

L. i. Did you use all of the materials recommended for this lesson?
Yes_____ No_____

ii. If no, what changes did you make?

M. Overall, how would you rate this lesson? [Circle one response.]

1.] very good
2.] average
3.] below average
4.] very poor

N. What effect did this lesson have on your students' behavior? [Circle one response.]

1.] a major positive change
2.] a minor positive change
3.] no change
4.] a minor negative change
5.] a major negative change

O. i. At the beginning of this Unit, a parent letter was sent to the homes of my students?
Yes_____ No_____

ii. If there were any responses to the letters, summarize them in the space below.

Second Step
Kindergarten
Task Checklist
Unit I: Empathy Training

Lesson 2: Feelings.

A. i. I conducted this unit in my class. Yes _____ No _____

ii. If yes, date started _____, date completed _____.

iii. In total, I spent approximately _____ minutes teaching this lesson.

B. i. Were the lesson and accompanying materials appropriate for your students' levels of development?

Yes_____ No_____

ii. If no, did you modify the instruction to match their levels of development?

Yes_____ No_____

C. i. Did the lesson accomplish the stated goal(s)?

Yes_____ No_____

ii. If no, did you modify the instruction to more adequately accomplish the lesson goal(s)?

Yes_____ No_____

D. i. Did the materials for this lesson adequately prepare you to deliver the lesson?

Yes_____ No_____

E. i. Was there a logical sequence to the lesson?

Yes_____ No_____

ii. If no, did you modify the sequence to meet your students' needs?

Yes_____ No_____

F. i. Did the lesson allot an adequate amount of time for the lesson?
Yes_____ No_____

ii. If no, did you modify the amount of time to better meet your students' needs?
Yes_____ No_____

G. i. Did the lesson provide adequate time for the students to practice the skill(s) being taught?
Yes_____ No_____

ii. If no, did you modify the instruction to increase the time for practice?
Yes_____ No_____

H. i. Did the lesson keep the students actively involved?
Yes_____ No_____

ii. If no, did you modify the instruction to increase student involvement?
Yes_____ No_____

I. i. Did the lesson and the accompanying materials motivate your students?
Yes_____ No_____

ii. If no, did you modify the instruction to increase motivation?
Yes_____ No_____

J. i. Did the materials for this lesson allow you to evaluate and make judgments about student performance?
Yes_____ No_____

ii. If no, did you modify the evaluation procedures to get this information?
Yes_____ No_____

K. i. Did the lesson adequately inform students of their performance and progress?
Yes_____ No_____

ii. If no, did you modify the procedures for providing student feedback?
Yes_____ No_____

L. i. Did you use all of the materials recommended for this lesson?
Yes_____ No_____

ii. If no, what changes did you make?

M. Overall, how would you rate this lesson? [Circle one response.]

1.] very good
2.] average
3.] below average
4.] very poor

N. What effect did this lesson have on your students' behavior? [Circle one response.]

1.] a major positive change
2.] a minor positive change
3.] no change
4.] a minor negative change
5.] a major negative change